COAP manuscript No.
(will be inserted by the editor)

Faster Subgradient Methods for Functions with Hölderian Growth

Patrick R. Johnstone · Pierre Moulin

arXiv:1704.00196v2 [math.OC] 21 Apr 2017

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract The purpose of this manuscript is to derive new convergence results for several subgradient methods for minimizing nonsmooth convex functions with Hölderian growth. The growth condition is satisfied in many applications and includes functions with quadratic growth and functions with weakly sharp minima as special cases. To this end there are four main contributions. First, for a constant and sufficiently small stepsize, we show that the subgradient method achieves linear convergence up to a certain region including the optimal set with error of the order of the stepsize. Second, we derive nonergodic convergence rates for the subgradient method under nonsummable decaying stepsizes. Thirdly if appropriate problem parameters are known we derive a possibly-summable stepsize which obtains a much faster convergence rate. Finally we develop a novel "descending stairs" stepsize which obtains this faster convergence rate but also obtains linear convergence for the special case of weakly sharp functions. We also develop a variant of the "descending stairs" stepsize which achieves essentially the same convergence rate without requiring an error bound constant which is difficult to estimate in practice.

1 Introduction

1.1 Motivation and Background

In this manuscript we consider the following problem:

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{C}} h(x), \tag{1}$$

where $\mathcal{H}$ is a Hilbert space, $h : \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a convex and closed function, and $\mathcal{C}$ is a convex, closed, and nonempty subset of $\mathcal{H}$. We do not assume h is

Patrick R. Johnstone (✉) · Pierre Moulin
Coordinated Science Laboratory, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL 61801, USA
e-mail: p.johnstone1987@gmail.com, pmoulin@illinois.edu

smooth or strongly convex. Solving Problem (1) arises in many applications such as image processing, machine learning, compressed sensing, statistics, and computer vision [16,15,18,52,14].

We are interested in first-order methods for solving this problem. Specifically, we focus on the class of *subgradient methods*, which were first studied in the 1960s [50,27]. Since then, these methods have been used extensively because of their simplicity and low per-iteration complexity [50,27,49,40,39, 42]. However in general these methods have a slow worst-case convergence rate of $h(\hat{x}_k) - \min_{x\in\mathcal{C}} h(x) \leq O(1/\sqrt{k})$ after k subgradient evaluations for a particular averaged point $\hat{x}_k$. In this manuscript we show how a structural assumption for Problem (1) that is commonly satisfied in practice yields faster variants of the subgradient method.

The structural assumption we consider is the *Hölder error bound* (throughout referred to as either HEB, HEB(c,θ), or Hölderian growth). We assume that h satisfies

$$h(x) - h^* \geq cd(x,\mathcal{X}_h)^{1/\theta}, \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{C},$$

for some $\theta \in (0,1]$ and $c > 0$, where $h^* = \min_{x\in\mathcal{C}} h(x)$, $\mathcal{X}_h \triangleq \{x \in \mathcal{C} : h(x) = h^*\}$ is the solution set (assumed to be nonempty), and $d(x,\mathcal{X}_h) = \inf_{x^*\in\mathcal{X}_h} \|x - x^*\|$. In general, an "error bound" is an upper bound on the distance of a point to the optimal set by some residual function. The study of error bounds has a long tradition in optimization, sensitivity analysis, systems of inequalities, projection methods, and convergence rate estimation [33,53,61, 57,9,13,60,44,36,23,12,31,6,10]. In recent years there has been much renewed interest in the topic. HEB is often referred to as the *Łojaziewicz error bound* [8] and is also related to the *Kurdyka–Łojaziewicz (KL) inequality* [9]. In fact in [9] it was shown that the KL inequality is equivalent to HEB for convex, closed, and proper functions.

There are three main motivations for studying the behavior of algorithms for problems satisfying HEB. Firstly HEB holds for many problems arising in various applications. In fact for a semialgebraic function HEB is guaranteed to hold on a compact set for some θ and c [9]. Secondly, many algorithms have been shown to achieve significantly faster convergence behavior when HEB is satisfied. Thirdly, under HEB it has been possible to develop even faster methods.

The two most common instances of HEB in practice are $\theta = 1/2$ and $\theta = 1$. The case $\theta = 1/2$ is often referred to as the *quadratic growth condition* (QG) [31]. The case $\theta = 1$ is often referred to by saying the function has *weakly sharp minima* (WS) [12]. If the minimum is unique, then it is simply a sharp minimum. We will also refer to this case by saying that the function is weakly sharp. There are also a small number of applications where $\theta \neq 1/2$ or 1, such as L_d regression with $d \neq 1, 2$.

Due to its prevalence in applications, many recent papers have studied QG (the $\theta = 1/2$ case). QG has been used to show a *linear* convergence rate of the objective function values for various algorithms, such as the proximal gradient method, that would otherwise only guarantee sublinear convergence [59,6,38,

29,61,19,31]. Many papers have discovered connections between QG and other error bounds and conditions known in the literature. Most importantly it was shown in [31, Appendix A] that for convex functions, QG is equivalent to the *Luo-Tseng* error bound [36], the *Polyak-Łojaziewicz* condition [31], and the *restricted secant inequality* [60].

Weakly sharp functions (i.e. $\theta = 1$) have been studied in many papers, for example [12,23,44,50,40,45,58,51,2]. For such functions [23] showed that the proximal point method converges to a minimum in a *finite* number of iterations. This is interesting because this method would otherwise only have an $O(1/k)$ rate.

1.2 Contributions

Recall the definition of the subgradient of h at x [5, Def. 16.1]:

$$\partial h(x) \triangleq \{g \in \mathcal{H} : h(y) \geq h(x) + \langle g, y - x\rangle, \forall y \in \mathcal{H}\}.$$

Define the *standard subgradient method* as

$$x_{k+1} = P_{\mathcal{C}}(x_k - \alpha_k g_k): \quad \forall k \geq 1, g_k \in \partial h(x_k),\ x_1 \in \mathcal{C}, \tag{2}$$

where $P_{\mathcal{C}}$ denotes the projection onto $\mathcal{C}$ and the choice of the *stepsize* α_k is not specified. Despite the long history of analysis of subgradient methods, the simplest stepsize choices for (2) have not been studied for objective functions satisfying HEB. These are the constant stepsize, $\alpha_k = \alpha$, and the nonsummable decaying stepsize, $\alpha_k = \alpha_1 k^{-p}$ for $p \in (0, 1]$. This brings us to our contributions in this manuscript.

Firstly we determine the convergence rate of a constant stepsize choice which previously had only been determined for the special case of $\theta = 1/2$ (see [39, Prop. 2.4]). Interestingly, *for any* $\theta \in (0, 1]$ the method obtains a linear convergence rate for $d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)$ up to a specific tolerance level of order $O(\alpha^\theta)$.

Secondly, we determine the convergence rate of both summable and nonsummable decaying polynomial stepsize choices. Previously, these results had only been obtained for the case where $\theta = 1/2$. For $\theta = 1$ the paper [35] obtains an asymptotic convergence rate for $p = 1$ with an additional global QG assumption. The big advantage of the nonsummable stepsizes is that, for $\theta \geq 1/2$, they require no information about the problem's parameters in order to guarantee convergence. In contrast, we show that summable stepsizes can obtain much faster rates with additional information. For instance summable stepsizes at the least require an upper bound on the initial distance to the solution set, otherwise convergence is impossible.

We frame our convergence rates in terms of $d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)$ because this quantity arises naturally in our analysis. If the rate of convergence of $h(\hat{x}_k)$ to h^* is known for some sequence $\hat{x}_k$, a näive estimate of the rate of convergence of

$d(\hat{x}_k, \mathcal{X}_h)$ can be obtained via the HEB. For example, the classical analysis of the subgradient method leads to the rate

$$h(\hat{x}_k) - h^* = O(k^{-\frac{1}{2}})$$

where $\hat{x}_k$ is a specific average of the previous iterates and $\alpha_k = O(1/\sqrt{k})$ [42]. Combining this with HEB yields

$$d(\hat{x}_k, \mathcal{X}_h) = O(k^{-\frac{\theta}{2}}).$$

This rate is slower than the result of our specialized analysis. For example, we show that with stepsize $\alpha_k = \alpha_1 k^{-p}$ and the proper choice of p and α_1, the subgradient method can obtain the convergence rate

$$d(x_k, \mathcal{X}) \leq O(k^{-\frac{\theta}{2(1-\theta)}}), \quad \forall \theta < 1. \tag{3}$$

It can be seen that the absolute value of the exponent is a factor $1/(1-\theta)$ larger in our analysis.

Our third major contribution is a new "descending stairs" stepsize choice for the subgradient method (DS-SG). The method achieves the convergence rate given in (3) for $\theta < 1$. In addition for the case $\theta = 1$ it achieves linear convergence. Unlike the methods of [47,48] and [7, Exercise 6.3.3], which also obtain linear convergence when $\theta = 1$, our proposal does not require h^*. The methods of [51,50,27] have a similar complexity for $\theta = 1$ but cannot handle $\theta < 1$.

The Restarted Subgradient method (RSG) [58] obtains the same iteration complexity as DS-SG but requires averaging, which is disadvantageous in applications where the solution is sparse (or low rank) because it can spoil this property [17]. In Section 6.2 we discuss other problems with averaging. Another advantage of DS-SG over RSG is that it retains the same iteration complexity even when the subgradients are corrupted, provided the noise is small relative to the sharpness constant c. An advantage of RSG is it only requires that HEB be satisfied locally, i.e. on a sufficiently-large level set of h. However in the important case where $\theta = 1$ this makes no difference, because if HEB holds with $\theta = 1$ on any compact set, then it holds globally [13]. Furthermore for many applications with $\theta < 1$, HEB is satisfied globally [9, 31].

DS-SG, RSG, and several other methods [27,50,51] require knowledge of the constant c in HEB which can be hard to estimate in practice. This motivates us to develop our final major contribution: a "doubling trick" for DS-SG which removes the dependence on c and still obtains the same iteration complexity, up to a small constant. We refer to this method as the "double descending stairs subgradient method" (DS2-SG). The competing methods of [58,51,50,27] all require knowledge of c. The authors of [58] proposed an adaptive method which does not require c, however it only works for $\theta < 1$.

In summary, our contributions under HEB are as follows:

Table 1 Summary of our contributions for constant, decaying polynomial (with correct α_1, p), DS-SG, and DS2-SG stepszes. The given convergence rates are for $d(x_k, \mathcal{X})^2$.

	constant	polynomial	DS-SG	DS2-SG
$\theta = 1$	$q^k + O(\alpha^{2\theta})$	Goffin [27]	$O(q^k)$	$O(q^k)$ and c not required
$\theta < 1$	$q^k + O(\alpha^{2\theta})$	$O\left(k^{\frac{\theta}{\theta-1}}\right)$	$O\left(k^{\frac{\theta}{\theta-1}}\right)$	$O\left(k^{\frac{\theta}{\theta-1}}\right)$ and c not required

1. We show that the subgradient method with a constant stepsize obtains linear convergence for $d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)$ to within a region of the optimal set for all $\theta \in (0, 1]$.
2. We compute nonasymptotic convergence rates for both nonsummable and summable decaying stepsizes under HEB for all $\theta \in (0, 1]$.
3. We develop a new "Descending Stairs" stepsize with iteration complexity $O(\epsilon^{1-\frac{1}{\theta}})$ when $\theta < 1$ and $\ln \frac{1}{\epsilon}$ when $\theta = 1$ for finding a point such that $d(x_k, \mathcal{X})^2 \leq \epsilon$. We also develop an adaptive variant which does not need c but retains the same iteration complexity up to a small constant.

Our contributions are summarized in Table 1.

The outline for the manuscript is as follows. In Sec. 1.3 we list some applications satisfying HEB. In Sec. 2 we discuss some previously known results for subgradient methods applied to functions satisfying HEB. In Sec. 3 we derive the key recursion which describes the subgradient method under HEB and allows us to obtain convergence rates. In Sec. 4 we determine the behavior of a constant stepsize. In Sec. 5 we derive a constant stepsize with explicit iteration complexity. In Sec. 6 we develop our proposed DS-SG. In Sec. 7 we develop the variant, DS2-SG, which does not require the error bound constant. In Sec. 8 we consider nonsummable decaying stepsizes. In Sec. 9 we derive a possibly-summable decaying stepsize with faster convergence rate than the nonsummable decaying stepsize. Finally, Sec. 10 features numerical experiments to test some of the theoretical findings of this paper.

1.3 Applications satisfying HEB

Strongly and uniformly convex functions.
A uniformly convex function satisfies

$$h(y) \geq h(x) + \langle g, y - x \rangle + \frac{\mu_{uc}}{2}\|y - x\|^d \quad \forall x, y \in \mathcal{H}, g \in \partial h(x), \tag{4}$$

for some $\mu_{uc} > 0$ and $d \geq 2$ [30]. This corresponds to strong convexity when $d = 2$ which is the most common special case. For a minimizer x^*, using the optimality criterion: $\langle g, y - x^* \rangle \geq 0$ for all $y \in \mathcal{C}$ and some $g \in \partial h(x^*)$, yields HEB with $\theta = 1/d$. Applications with $d > 2$ include L_d regression (discussed below) and polynomial convex optimization [33].

Least squares and Logistic Regression.

The paper [31] showed that functions of the form $h(x) = h_0(Ax)$ where h_0 is strongly convex and A is a matrix satisfy QG. This includes the ubiquitous least-squares objective. Logistic regression is in the form $h(x) = h_0(Ax)$ however h_0 is only strictly convex. Nevertheless, it is strongly convex on any bounded set.

Lasso (ℓ_1 regularized Least-squares). The famous ℓ_1-regularized least squares problem was shown in [9, Lemma 10] to satisfy HEB on a compact set. QG is also shown to be locally satisfied by the group lasso penalized least-squares and logistic regression in [53, Theorem 2].

Composite Optimization. The paper [61] considers the problem

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{H}} h_0(Ax) + P(x)$$

where h is strongly convex on any bounded set and P is polyhedral or the group lasso penalty. Rather surprisingly, they showed in [61] that this function satisfies a local version of QG. The result also applies when P is the nuclear norm so long as a strict complementarity condition is satisfied.

L_d Norm Regression Estimators.

The goal of linear regression is to estimate a vector $\beta_{L_d} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ given a noisy version of its linear measurements $y = X^\top \beta_{L_d} + e$ where e is an unknown noise term. If e conforms to a Gaussian distribution then the least squares estimate is the maximum likelihood estimator. If the noise is not Gaussian, then the performance of the least squares estimator can be significantly degraded. The L_d estimator with $d \neq 2$ has been considered as an alternative [37,43,1]. It is given by

$$\arg\min_{\beta_{L_d}} \sum_{i=1}^{m} |X(i)^\top \beta_{L_d} - y_i|^d \tag{5}$$

for $d \geq 1$, where $X(i)$ is the ith column of X. The case $d = 2$ corresponds to least squares, and $d = 1$ to least-absolute deviations regression. Other choices of d have been considered in [37,43,1]. It is not hard to see that (5) satisfies the KL inequality with $\theta = 1/d$. Therefore by [9, Thm 5] it satisfies HEB with $\theta = 1/d$.

Polyhedral Convex Optimization.

Suppose that the function h in Problem (1) has a polyhedral epigraph (i.e. is piecewise linear), then Problem (1) is called a polyhedral convex optimization (PCO) problem. In this case, [58] showed that WS is satisfied globally. Many applications are instances of PCO. For instance both the hinge loss used in SVM classification and the ℓ_1 loss/regularizer used in robust regression are polyhedral. Linear programming is PCO. Another very important application is submodular optimization. The Lovász extension is a convex relaxation for submodular optimization problems which is PCO [3].

2 Prior Results on Subgradient Methods under HEB

There were several early works that studied the subgradient method under conditions related to HEB with $\theta = 1$. In [50, Thm 2.7, Sec. 2.3], Shor proposed a geometrically decaying stepsize which obtains a linear convergence rate under a condition equivalent to HEB with $\theta = 1$. The stepsize depends on explicit knowledge of the error bound constant c, a bound on the subgradients, and the initial distance $d(x_1, \mathcal{X}_h)$. Goffin [27], extended the analysis of [50] to a slightly more general notion than HEB. Our analysis in this manuscript also holds for Goffin's condition, see Sec. 10.8. Rosenburg [49] extended these results to constrained problems. In [45], Polyak showed that the method still converges linearly when the subgradients are corrupted by bounded, deterministic noise. Our optimal decaying stepsize derived in Sec. 9 is a natural extension of Goffin's geometrically-decaying stepsize to $\theta < 1$.

The paper [40] also considers functions satisfying HEB with $\theta = 1$ with (deterministically) noisy subgradients. For constant stepsizes, they show convergence of $\liminf h(x_k)$ to h^* plus a tolerance level depending on noise. For diminishing stepsizes, $\liminf h(x_k)$ actually converges to h^* despite the noise. However [40] does not discuss *convergence rates*, which is the topic of our work.

As mentioned in the introduction, [58] introduced the *restarted subgradient method* (RSG) for when h satisfies HEB. The method implements a predetermined number of averaged subgradient iterations with a constant stepsize and then restarts the averaging and uses a new, smaller stepsize. The authors show that after $O(\epsilon^{2(\theta-1)} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ iterations the method is guaranteed to find a point such that $h(x_k) - h^* \leq \epsilon$. For $\theta = 1$ this is a logarithmic iteration complexity. This improves the iteration complexity of the classical subgradient method which is $O(\epsilon^{-2})$. Differences between our results and RSG will be discussed in Sec. 6.2.

The recent paper [57] extends RSG to stochastic optimization. In particular they provide a similar restart scheme that can also handle stochastic subgradient calls, and guarantees $h(x) - h^* \leq \epsilon$ with high probability. The iteration complexity is the same as for RSG, up to constants. However, this constant is large leading to a large number of inner iterations, making it difficult to implement the method in practice.

For HEB with $\theta = 1$, the paper [51] introduced a method similar to RSG except it does not require averaging at the end of each constant stepsize phase. The method also obtains a logarithmic iteration complexity in the $\theta = 1$ case. This method is essentially a special case of our proposed DS-SG for $\theta = 1$.

The paper [26] is concerned with a two-person zero-sum game equilibrium problem with a linear payoff structure. The authors show that finding the solution to the equilibrium problem is equivalent to a WS minimization problem. Using this fact, they derive a method based on Nesterov's smoothing technique with logarithmic iteration complexity. This is superior to the $O(1/\epsilon)$ of standard Nesterov smoothing. Connections between our results and [26] are discussed in Section 6.2.

The work [35] studies stochastic subgradient descent under the assumption that the function satisfies WS locally and QG globally. They show a faster convergence rate of the iterates to a minimizer, both in expectation and with high probability, than is known under the classical analysis. The convergence rate matches our derived rate for $p = 1$ in Sec. 8.

The work [24] proposes a new subgradient method for functions satisfying a similar condition to HEB but with h^* replaced by a strict lower bound on h^*. Like RSG, this algorithm has a logarithmic dependence on the initial distance to the solution set. However it still obtains an $O(1/\epsilon^2)$ iteration complexity, which is the same as the classical subgradient method.

In [47,48] Renegar presented a framework for converting a convex conic program to a general convex problem with an affine constraint, to which projected subgradient methods can be applied. He further showed how this can be applied to general convex optimization problems, such as Prob. (1), by representing them as a conic problem. For the special case where the objective and constraint set is polyhedral, one of the subgradient methods proposed by Renegar has a logarithmic iteration complexity [47, Cor. 3.4]. The main drawback of this method is that it requires knowledge of the optimal value, h^*. It also requires a point in the interior of the constraint set. Similarly the stepsizes proposed in Thm. 2 of [46, Sec 5.3.] and [39, Prop. 2.11] depend on exact knowledge of h^* and also obtain a logarithmic iteration complexity under WS.

In recent times, convergence analyses for the subgradient method have focused on the objective function rather than the distance of the iterates from the optimal set. However in the early period of development, there were many works focusing on the distance (e.g. [39,50,45,27]). The subgradient method is not a descent method with respect to function values, however it is with respect to the distances to the optimal set. Thus the distance is a natural metric to study for the subgradient method. Furthermore, for some applications, the distance to the solution set arguably matters more than the objective function value. For example in machine learning, the objective function is only a surrogate for the actual objective of interest – expected prediction error.

Without further assumptions, [46, p. 167–168] showed that the convergence rate of the distance of the iterates of the subgradient method to the optimal set can be made arbitrarily slow. This is true even for smooth convex problems. In this case, gradient descent with a constant stepsize obtains an $O(1/k)$ *objective function* convergence rate, however the iterates can be made to converge arbitrarily slowly to a minimizer. It is our use of HEB that allows us to derive less pessimistic convergence rates for the distance to the optimal set.

3 The Key Recursion

In this section we derive the recursion which describes the evolution of the squared error $d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2$ for the iterates of the standard subgradient method under HEB. The same recursion has been derived many times before for the special cases $\theta = \{1/2, 1\}$ (e.g. [27,50,39]).

3.1 Optimality Condition and Assumptions

If 0 is in the strict relative interior of $\mathcal{C} - \mathrm{dom}(h)$ then the solution set $\mathcal{X}_h$ of Problem (1) is characterized by the optimality condition [5, Prop. 26.5]

$$\mathcal{X}_h = \{x : 0 \in \partial h(x) + N_{\mathcal{C}}(x)\}$$

where $N_{\mathcal{C}}(x)$ is the normal cone of $\mathcal{C}$ at x. Note that we don't explicitly use this optimality criterion anywhere in our analysis and we only include it for completeness.

For Prob. (1), throughout the manuscript we will assume that $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{dom}(\partial h)$, so that for any query point $x \in \mathcal{C}$ it is possible to find a $g \in \partial h(x)$. If h is convex and closed, the solution set $\mathcal{X}_h = \{x : h(x) = h^*\}$ is convex and closed [5]. Here are the precise assumptions we will use throughout the manuscript.

Assumption 3. (Problem (1)). Assume $\mathcal{C}$ is convex, closed, and nonempty. Assume h is convex, closed, and satisfies HEB(c, θ). Assume $\mathcal{X}_h$ is nonempty. Assume $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathrm{dom}(\partial h)$. Assume there exists a constant G such that $\|g\| \leq G$ for all $g \in \partial h(x)$ and $x \in \mathcal{C}$.

Throughout the manuscript let $\kappa \triangleq G/c$.

3.2 The Recursion under HEB

Proposition 1 *Suppose Assumption 3 holds. Then for all $k \geq 1$ for the iterates $\{x_k\}$ of (2)*

$$d(x_{k+1}, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 \leq d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 - 2\alpha_k c (d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2)^{\frac{1}{2\theta}} + \alpha_k^2 G^2. \tag{6}$$

Proof For the point x_k let x_k^* be the unique projection of x_k onto $\mathcal{X}_h$. For $k \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_{k+1}, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 &= \|x_{k+1} - x_{k+1}^*\|^2 \\ &\leq \|x_{k+1} - x_k^*\|^2 \\ &\leq d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 - 2\alpha_k \langle g_k, x_k - x_k^* \rangle + \alpha_k^2 \|g_k\|^2 \\ &\leq d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 - 2\alpha_k \left(h(x_k) - h*\right) + \alpha_k^2 G^2 \\ &\leq d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 - 2\alpha_k c (d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2)^{\frac{1}{2\theta}} + \alpha_k^2 G^2. \end{aligned}$$

In the first inequality, we used the fact that x_{k+1}^* is the closest point to x_{k+1} in $\mathcal{X}_h$. In the second inequality we used the nonexpansiveness of the projection operator. In the third, we used the convexity of h and in the final inequality we used the error bound.

Let $e_k \triangleq d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2$ and $\gamma = \frac{1}{2\theta} \in [\frac{1}{2}, +\infty)$ then for all $k \geq 1$

$$0 \leq e_{k+1} \leq e_k - 2\alpha_k c e_k^{\gamma} + \alpha_k^2 G^2. \tag{7}$$

The main effort of our analysis is in deriving convergence rates for this recursion for various stepsizes.

4 Constant Stepsize

Consider the projected subgradient method with *constant*, or fixed, stepsize α given in Algorithm FixedSG. Previously it was shown that if $\theta = 1/2$ then this

Algorithm 1: (FixedSG)

Require: $K > 0$, $\alpha > 0$, $x_1 \in \mathcal{C}$
for $k = 1, 2, \ldots, K$ **do**
  $x_{k+1} = P_{\mathcal{C}}\left(x_k - \alpha g_k\right) : \quad g_k \in \partial h(x_k)$
end for
return x_{k+1}

method achieves linear convergence to within a region of the solution set [39, 31]. Rather suprisingly, we show in the next theorem that linear convergence to within a certain region of $\mathcal{X}_h$ occurs for any $\theta \in (0, 1]$.

Theorem 1 *Suppose Assumption 3 holds. Let* $e_* = \left(\frac{\alpha G^2}{2c}\right)^{2\theta}$.

1. *For all* $k \geq 1$ *the iterates of FixedSG satisfy*

$$d(x_k, \mathcal{X})^2 \leq \max\left\{d(x_1, \mathcal{X})^2, e_* + \alpha^2 G^2\right\}. \tag{8}$$

2. *If* $0 < \theta \leq \frac{1}{2}$ *then for all* $k \geq 2$ *the iterates of FixedSG satisfy*

$$d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 - e_* \leq q_1^{k-1}(d(x_1, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 - e_*). \tag{9}$$

where

$$q_1 = \left(1 - \frac{1}{\theta}\alpha c e_*^{\frac{1-2\theta}{2\theta}}\right). \tag{10}$$

If additionally

$$0 < \alpha < 2\theta^{\frac{1}{2(1-\theta)}} G^{\frac{2\theta-1}{1-\theta}} c^{\frac{\theta}{\theta-1}} \tag{11}$$

then $q_1 \in (-1, 1)$.

3. *If* $\frac{1}{2} \leq \theta \leq 1$, *for the iterates of FixedSG* $d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 \leq D$ *for all* k, *and*

$$0 < \alpha < \frac{2\theta D^{1-\frac{1}{2\theta}}}{c}, \tag{12}$$

then for all $k \geq 2$

$$d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 - e_* \leq \max\{q_2^{k-1}(d(x_1, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 - e_*), e_* + \alpha^2 G^2\}, \tag{13}$$

where

$$q_2 = 1 - \frac{\alpha c D^{\frac{1}{2\theta}-1}}{\theta} \in (-1, 1).$$

Proof Recall our notation $e_k = d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2$ and let $\gamma = \frac{1}{2\theta}$. Returning to the main recursion (7) derived in Prop. 1 and replacing the stepsize with a constant yields

$$0 \leq e_{k+1} \leq e_k - 2\alpha c e_k^\gamma + \alpha^2 G^2, \tag{14}$$

where $\gamma \geq \frac{1}{2}$. We would like to derive the convergence rate of $e_k - e_*$ to 0, where $e_* = \left(\frac{\alpha G^2}{2c}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}$ is the the only fixed point of this recursion, which is derived by setting $e_k = e_{k+1} = e_*$. The key is to write the recursion (14) as

$$e_{k+1} - e_* \leq e_k - e_* - 2\alpha c(e_k^\gamma - e_*^\gamma). \tag{15}$$

Boundedness:
We first prove (8), which says that e_k is bounded. Considering (15) we see that if $e_k \geq e_*$ then $e_{k+1} \leq e_k$. On the other hand, if $e_k \leq e_*$, then (14) yields $e_{k+1} \leq e_k + \alpha^2 G^2 \leq e_* + \alpha^2 G^2$. Therefore

$$e_{k+1} \leq \max\{e_k, e_* + \alpha^2 G^2\} \leq \max\{e_1, e_* + \alpha^2 G^2\}.$$

Case 1: $\boldsymbol{\theta \leq \frac{1}{2}}$.
For $\theta \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $\gamma \geq 1$ and by the convexity of t^γ,

$$e_k^\gamma - e_*^\gamma \geq \gamma e_*^{\gamma-1}(e_k - e_*).$$

Using this in (15) yields

$$e_{k+1} - e_* \leq (1 - 2\alpha c\gamma e_*^{\gamma-1})(e_k - e_*).$$

Thus so long as

$$-1 < 1 - 2\alpha c\gamma e_*^{\gamma-1} < 1, \tag{16}$$

linear convergence is guaranteed. Simplifying (16) yields

$$\begin{aligned} 2\alpha c\gamma e_*^{\gamma-1} &< 2 \\ &\implies \alpha c\gamma \left(\frac{\alpha G^2}{2c}\right)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}} < 1 \\ &\implies \alpha < \left(\frac{1}{\gamma} G^{\frac{2(1-\gamma)}{\gamma}} 2^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}} c^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}}\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{2\gamma-1}} \end{aligned}$$

which implies (9), (10), and (11).
Case 2: $\boldsymbol{\theta \geq \frac{1}{2}}$.
For $\theta \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, $\gamma \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, which implies by concavity

$$e_*^\gamma - e_k^\gamma \leq \gamma e_k^{\gamma-1}(e_* - e_k).$$

Therefore

$$e_k^\gamma - e_*^\gamma \geq \gamma e_k^{\gamma-1}(e_k - e_*).$$

Substituting this inequality into (15) yields

$$e_{k+1} - e_* \leq e_k - e_* - 2\alpha c\gamma e_k^{\gamma-1}(e_k - e_*).$$

Now if $e_* \leq e_k$, then since $e_k \leq D$,

$$e_{k+1} - e_* \leq (1 - 2\alpha c\gamma D^{\gamma-1})(e_k - e_*) = q_2(e_k - e_*).$$

So long as

$$1 > 1 - 2\alpha c\gamma D^{\gamma-1} > -1$$

(which is implied by (12)), we have $q_2 \in (-1, 1)$. On the other hand if $e_k \leq e_*$ then, using (14), $e_{k+1} \leq e_* + \alpha^2 G^2$. Thus for all $k \geq 1$

$$e_{k+1} - e_* \leq \max\left\{q_2(e_k - e_*), e_* + \alpha^2 G^2\right\}.$$

Iterating this recursion and using the fact that $q_2 \in (-1, 1)$ yields (13).

5 Iteration Complexity for Constant Stepsize

Using the results of the previous section we can derive the iteration complexity of a constant stepsize for finding a point such that $d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 \leq \epsilon$. The basic idea in the following theorem is to pick $\alpha = O(\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2\theta}})$, so that e_* defined in Theorem 1 is equal to ϵ. Then the iteration complexity can be determined from the linear convergence rate of $d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2$ to e_*.

Theorem 2 *Suppose Assumption 3 holds. Choose $\epsilon > 0$ and set*

$$\alpha = \frac{2c\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2\theta}}}{G^2}. \tag{17}$$

1. *If $0 < \theta \leq \frac{1}{2}$, and*

$$0 < \epsilon \leq \left(\frac{\theta\kappa^2}{2}\right)^{\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}}, \tag{18}$$

then for the iterates of FixedSG, $d(x_{k+1}, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 \leq 2\epsilon$ for all $k \geq K$ where

$$K \triangleq \frac{1}{2}\theta\kappa^2 \ln\left(\frac{d(x_1, \mathcal{X}_h)^2}{\epsilon}\right)\epsilon^{1-\frac{1}{\theta}}.$$

2. *If $\frac{1}{2} \leq \theta \leq 1$ and*

$$0 < \epsilon \leq \min\left\{\left(\frac{\kappa^2}{4}\right)^{\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}}, \left(\frac{\theta\kappa^2}{2}\right)^{2\theta} D^{2\theta-1}\right\}, \tag{19}$$

then for the iterates of FixedSG, $d(x_{k+1}, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 \leq 3\epsilon$ for all $k \geq K$, where

$$K \triangleq \frac{1}{2}\theta\kappa^2 D^{1-\frac{1}{2\theta}} \ln\left(\frac{d(x_1, \mathcal{X}_h)^2}{\epsilon}\right)\epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2\theta}}, \text{ and} \tag{20}$$

$$D \geq 2\max\{d(x_1, \mathcal{X}_h)^2, \epsilon\}. \tag{21}$$

Proof We consider the two cases, $\theta \leq 1/2$ and $\theta \geq 1/2$, separately.
Case 1: $\boldsymbol{\theta \leq \frac{1}{2}}$.
From Theorem 1, the convergence factor in the constant stepsize case is $q_1 = 1 - \frac{\alpha c}{\theta} e_*^{\frac{1}{2\theta}-1}$ where $e_* = \left(\frac{\alpha G^2}{2c}\right)^{2\theta}$. Recall the notation $e_k = d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2$. From Theorem 1 we know that for all $k \geq 1$

$$e_{k+1} - e_* \leq q_1^k (e_1 - e_*).$$

Now note that by the choice of α, $e_* = \epsilon$. Furthermore, since ϵ satisfies (18), $q_1 \geq 0$, thus

$$e_{k+1} - e_* \leq q_1^k e_1.$$

This means that

$$\ln(\max\{0, e_{k+1} - e_*\}) \leq k \ln q_1 + \ln e_1$$

using the convention, $\ln(0) = -\infty$. Thus $e_{k+1} - e_* \leq \epsilon$ is implied by

$$k \ln q_1 + \ln e_1 \leq \ln \epsilon \iff k \geq \frac{\ln \frac{e_1}{\epsilon}}{\ln \frac{1}{q_1}}.$$

Now

$$\ln q_1 = \ln\left(1 - \frac{\alpha c}{\theta} e_*^{\frac{1}{2\theta}-1}\right) \leq -\frac{\alpha c}{\theta} e_*^{\frac{1}{2\theta}-1} \iff \ln \frac{1}{q_1} \geq \frac{\alpha c}{\theta} e_*^{\frac{1}{2\theta}-1}.$$

Therefore if

$$k \geq \frac{\theta \ln \frac{e_1}{\epsilon}}{\alpha c e_*^{\frac{1}{2\theta}-1}} = \frac{\theta G^2 \ln \frac{e_1}{\epsilon}}{2c^2 \epsilon^{\frac{1}{\theta}-1}} = \frac{1}{2}\theta\kappa^2 \ln\left(\frac{e_1}{\epsilon}\right) \epsilon^{1-\frac{1}{\theta}}$$

then

$$e_{k+1} \leq e_* + \epsilon = 2\epsilon.$$

Case 2: $\boldsymbol{\theta \geq \frac{1}{2}}$.
As before, $\alpha = \frac{2c\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2\theta}}}{G^2}$ which implies $e_* = \epsilon$. First note that by Part 1 of Theorem 1,

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 &\leq \max\{d(x_1, \mathcal{X}_h)^2, e_* + \alpha^2 G^2\} \\ &= \max\left\{d(x_1, \mathcal{X}_h)^2, \epsilon + \frac{4c^2}{G^2}\epsilon^{\frac{1}{\theta}}\right\} \\ &\leq \max\{d(x_1, \mathcal{X}_h)^2, 2\epsilon\} \\ &\leq D \end{aligned}$$

for all $k \geq 1$, where in the second inequality we used (19). Recalling (13) we see that

$$e_{k+1} \leq \max\{e_* + q_2^k (d(x_1, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 - e_*), 2e_* + \alpha^2 G^2\}. \tag{22}$$

Consider the first argument to the max in (22). This case is the same as Case 1 for $\theta \leq 1/2$, except for a different convergence factor. The convergence factor is

$$q_2 = 1 - \frac{\alpha c}{\theta} D^{\frac{1}{2\theta}-1}$$

which is greater than or equal to 0 (and less than 1) if ϵ satisfies (19). Thus

$$\ln q_2 = \ln\left(1 - \frac{\alpha c}{\theta} D^{\frac{1}{2\theta}-1}\right) \leq -\frac{\alpha c}{\theta} D^{\frac{1}{2\theta}-1} \implies \ln \frac{1}{q_2} \geq \frac{\alpha c}{\theta} D^{\frac{1}{2\theta}-1}.$$

Therefore if

$$k \geq \frac{\theta G^2 D^{1-\frac{1}{2\theta}}}{2c^2} \ln\left(\frac{e_1}{\epsilon}\right) \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2\theta}}$$

then the first argument to max in (22) is upper bounded by 2ϵ.

Now consider the second argument to the max in (22), which is

$$2e_* + \alpha^2 G^2 = 2\epsilon + \alpha^2 G^2 = 2\epsilon + \frac{4c^2}{G^2}\epsilon^{1/\theta} \leq 3\epsilon,$$

where we have used again (19).

Rather surprisingly, Theorem 2 shows that restarting is not necessary for $\theta \leq \frac{1}{2}$. This is because for $\theta \leq \frac{1}{2}$ the iteration complexity for a constant stepsize is equal to the complexity of RSG derived in [58]. It is also matched by the optimal decaying stepsize derived in Sec. 9. In more detail, [58] showed that the restart method requires $O(\epsilon'^{2(\theta-1)})$ iterations (suppressing constants and a $\ln \frac{1}{\epsilon}$ factor) to achieve $h(x) - h^* \leq \epsilon'$. Now, using the error bound, in order to guarantee $d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 \leq \epsilon$, we need $h(x) - h^* \leq \epsilon' = \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2\theta}}$. Using this in the iteration complexity from [58] yields an iteration complexity of $O(\epsilon^{1-\frac{1}{\theta}})$, which is the same as the constant stepsize for $\theta \leq 1/2$. However, for $\theta > \frac{1}{2}$, RSG, our DS-SG method, and our optimal decaying stepsize, are significantly faster than the constant stepsize choice. For $\theta = 1/2$, the iteration complexity of the constant stepsize derived in Theorem 2 depends on $\ln d(x_1, \mathcal{X})$, and has the same dependence on ϵ as the other methods. This remarkable property makes it preferable to the other more sophisticated methods in this case.

The comparison with the classical result for the subgradient method is as follows. It is easy to show that for the subgradient method with a constant stepsize α:

$$\frac{1}{k}\sum_{i=1}^{k}(h(x_i) - h^*) \leq \frac{d(x_1, \mathcal{X}_h)^2}{2\alpha k} + \frac{\alpha}{2}G^2.$$

Setting

$$\alpha = \frac{c\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2\theta}}}{G^2}$$

and

$$k \geq \kappa^2 d(x_1, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 \epsilon^{-1/\theta}$$

implies

$$h(x_k^{av}) - h^* \leq \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} (h(x_i) - h^*) \leq c\epsilon^{1/2\theta}$$

where $x_k^{av} = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} x_i$. Now using the error bound, this yields $d(x_k^{av}, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 \leq \epsilon$. With respect to ϵ, this classical iteration complexity is clearly worse than the result of Theorem 1 for all $\theta \in (0, 1]$. Furthermore, the dependence on $d(x_1, \mathcal{X}_h)$ is worse. For $\theta \leq 1/2$, the fixed stepsize depends on $\ln d(x_1, \mathcal{X}_h)$, whereas the classical stepsize has iteration complexity which depends linearly on $d(x_1, \mathcal{X}_h)$.

We note that as $\theta \to 0$ the iteration complexity can be made arbitrarily large. This is not suprising, as it has been proved in [46, p. 167-168] that the convergence rate of $x_k \to x^*$ can be made arbitrarily bad for gradient methods.

6 A "Descending Stairs" Stepsize with Better Complexity for $\theta > 1/2$

6.1 The Method

In this section we propose a new stepsize for the subgradient method (DS-SG) which obtains a better iteration complexity than the fixed stepsize for $\theta > 1/2$. In fact for $\theta = 1$ the iteration complexity is logarithmic, i.e. $O(\ln \frac{1}{\epsilon})$. The basic idea is to use a constant stepsize in the subgradient method and every K iterations reduce the stepsize by a factor of $\beta_{ds}^{\frac{1}{2\theta}} > 1$. Also the number of iterations K increases by a factor $\beta_{ds}^{\frac{1}{\theta}-1}$. Our analysis allows us to determine good choices for the initial stepsize and number of iterations which lead to an improved rate.

The algorithm is similar to RSG [58]. However our method has some important advantages, which will be discussed in Sec. 6.2, and a different analysis. As was mentioned earlier, the method of [51, Sec. V] is essentially a special case of DS-SG for $\theta = 1$.

DS-SG requires an upper bound on the distance of the starting point to the solution, i.e. $\Omega_1 \geq d(x_{\text{init}}, \mathcal{X}_h)^2$. If $\mathcal{C}$ is bounded then one can use the diameter of $\mathcal{C}$. If a lower bound on the optimal value is known, i.e. $h_l \leq h^*$, then by the error bound $d(x_1, \mathcal{X}_h) \leq c^{-1} \left(h(x_1) - h^*\right)^\theta \leq c^{-1} \left(h(x_1) - h_l\right)^\theta$ implies we can use $\Omega_1 = c^{-2} \left(h(x_1) - h_l\right)^{2\theta}$.

Theorem 3 *Suppose Assumption 3 holds and $\frac{1}{2} \leq \theta \leq 1$. Choose $x_{init} \in \mathcal{C}$ and Ω_1 such that $d(x_{init}, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 \leq \Omega_1$. Choose $\beta_{ds} > 1$ so that*

$$\beta_{ds} \geq \frac{1}{3} \max \left\{ \left(\frac{\kappa^2}{4} \right)^{\frac{\theta}{\theta-1}} \Omega_1, 2\theta^{-2\theta} \kappa^{-4\theta} \Omega_1^{2(1-\theta)} \right\}. \tag{23}$$

Algorithm 2: (DS-SG) Descending Stairs Subgradient Method for $\theta > 1/2$

Require: β_{ds}, M, x_{init}, Ω_1, G, c, θ.
1: $\kappa = \frac{G}{c}$
2: $K_1 = \left\lceil \theta\kappa^2 \left(\frac{3\beta_{ds}}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2\theta}} \ln(3\beta_{ds})\, \Omega_1^{1-\frac{1}{\theta}} \right\rceil$
3: $\alpha(1) = \frac{2c}{G^2}\left(\frac{\Omega_1}{3\beta_{ds}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2\theta}}$
4: $\hat{x}_0 = x_{\text{init}}$
5: **for** $m = 1, 2, \ldots, M$ **do**
6: $\quad \hat{x}_m = \text{FixedSG}(K_m, \alpha(m), \hat{x}_{m-1})$
7: $\quad \alpha(m+1) = \beta_{ds}^{-\frac{1}{2\theta}}\alpha(m)$
8: $\quad K_{m+1} = \beta_{ds}^{\frac{1}{\theta}-1} K_m$
9: **end for**
10: **return** $\hat{x}_M$

(Note that if $\theta = 1$, (23) reduces to the simple requirement that $\beta_{ds} > 1$.) Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and choose $M \geq \left\lceil \frac{\ln \frac{\Omega_1}{\epsilon}}{\ln \beta_{ds}} \right\rceil$. Then for $\hat{x}_M$ returned by Algorithm DS-SG, $d(\hat{x}_M, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 \leq \epsilon$. The iteration complexity is as follows:

1. *If $\theta = 1$ this requires at most*

$$\left(\frac{3\beta_{ds}}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \kappa^2 \ln(3\beta_{ds}) \left(\frac{\ln \frac{\Omega_1}{\epsilon}}{\ln \beta_{ds}} + 1\right) \tag{24}$$

$$= O\left(\kappa^2 \ln \frac{\Omega_1}{\epsilon}\right) \tag{25}$$

subgradient evaluations.

If $\theta < 1$ this requires at most

$$\frac{2\theta\beta_{ds}^{\frac{1}{\theta}-1}}{\beta_{ds}^{\frac{1}{\theta}-1} - 1} \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2\theta}} \kappa^2 \beta_{ds}^{\frac{1}{2\theta}} \ln(3\beta_{ds}) \epsilon^{1-\frac{1}{\theta}} \tag{26}$$

$$= \tilde{O}\left(\max\left\{\kappa^2, \kappa^{\frac{2\theta-1}{\theta-1}} \Omega_1^{\frac{1}{2\theta}}, \Omega_1^{\frac{1}{\theta}-1}\right\} \epsilon^{1-\frac{1}{\theta}}\right) \tag{27}$$

subgradient evaluations, where $\tilde{O}$ suppresses constants and terms which depend on $\log\kappa$ or $\log\Omega_1$.

Proof We need some new notation. For $\hat{x}_m$ defined in line 6 of DS-SG, let $\hat{e}_m = d(\hat{x}_m, \mathcal{X}_h)^2$. We will use a sequence of tolerances $\{\epsilon_m\}$ defined as $\epsilon_m = \beta_{ds}^{-m}\Omega_1$. Another sequence $\{D_m\}$ is chosen as

$$D_m = 2\beta_{ds}\epsilon_m.$$

Then the stepsize $\alpha(m)$, defined on lines (3)–(7) of DS-SG, can be written as

$$\alpha(m) = \frac{2c}{G^2}\left(\frac{\epsilon_m}{3}\right)^{\frac{1}{2\theta}}.$$

Furthermore note that the number of iterations K_m, defined on lines (2)–(8) of DS-SG, can be written as

$$K_m = \left\lceil \frac{3^{\frac{1}{2\theta}}\theta G^2}{2^{\frac{1}{2\theta}}c^2}\beta_{ds}^{1-\frac{1}{2\theta}} \ln\left(3\beta_{ds}\right)\epsilon_m^{1-\frac{1}{\theta}} \right\rceil. \tag{28}$$

The set $\{\epsilon_m/3, D_m, K_m, \alpha(m)\}$ will be used in statement 2 of Theorem 2 in place of $\{\epsilon, D, K, \alpha\}$. This will show that $\hat{e}_m \leq \epsilon_m$.

We now show that $\{\epsilon_m/3, D_m, K_m, \alpha(m)\}$ satisfy (17), (19), (20), and (21). By definition, $\alpha(m)$ satisfies (17) for all $m \geq 1$. Next we prove that condition (23) ensures that (19) is satisfied for all $m \geq 1$. The first argument to the min in (19) requires that

$$\frac{\epsilon_m}{3} = \frac{1}{3}\beta_{ds}^{-m}\Omega_1 \leq \left(\frac{\kappa^2}{4}\right)^{\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}}.$$

In order for this to be satisfied for all m, it suffices to show that it holds for $m = 1$. This is implied by the first argument to the max function in (23). The second argument to the min in (19) requires

$$\frac{\epsilon_m}{3} \leq \left(\frac{\theta\kappa^2}{2}\right)^{2\theta} D_m^{2\theta-1} = \frac{1}{2}\left(\theta\kappa^2\right)^{2\theta}\beta_{ds}^{2\theta-1}\epsilon_m^{2\theta-1}.$$

Using $\epsilon_m = \beta_{ds}^{-m}\Omega_1$ and rearranging this yields

$$\beta_{ds}^{2m(1-\theta)+2\theta-1} \geq \frac{2}{3}\theta^{-2\theta}\kappa^{-4\theta}\Omega_1^{2(1-\theta)}.$$

In order to hold for all $m \geq 1$ it suffices to show it holds for $m = 1$, which is implied by the second argument in the max in (23).

In the case $\theta = 1$ note that (23) reduces to

$$\beta_{ds} \geq \frac{2}{3\kappa^4} \leq \frac{2}{3},$$

since $\kappa \geq 1$ when $\theta = 1$ (and typically $\kappa \gg 1$). Therefore for $\theta = 1$, any $\beta_{ds} > 1$ will suffice.

Finally we prove (20) and (21) by induction. For $m = 1$, D_1 clearly satisfies (21). Also K_1, given in Line 1 of Algorithm DS-SG, satisfies (20). Altogether this implies $\hat{e}_1 \leq \epsilon_1$.

Next, assume it holds true at iteration $m-1$, which implies by Theorem 1 $\hat{e}_{m-1} \leq \epsilon_{m-1}$. Since FixedSG is initialized at $\hat{x}_{m-1}$, and $d(\hat{x}_{m-1}, \mathcal{X})^2 \leq \epsilon_{m-1}$, then

$$D_m = 2\beta_{ds}\epsilon_m = 2\epsilon_{m-1}$$

satisfies (21). Next to satisfy (20) we require

$$K_m \geq \frac{3^{\frac{1}{2\theta}}\theta G^2}{2c^2} \ln\left(\frac{3d(\hat{x}_{m-1}, \mathcal{X}_h)^2}{\epsilon_m}\right) D_m^{1-\frac{1}{2\theta}}\epsilon_m^{-\frac{1}{2\theta}} \tag{29}$$

which is satisfied by K_m. This can be seen by substituting $D_m = 2\beta_{ds}\epsilon_m$ and $d(\hat{x}_{m-1}, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 \leq \epsilon_{m-1} = \beta_{ds}\epsilon_m$ into (29), and comparing with (28).

We have shown that $\{\epsilon_m/3, D_m, K_m, \alpha(m)\}$ satisfies (17), (19), (20), and (21). Thus by part 2 of Theorem 1, $\hat{e}_m \leq 3(\epsilon_m/3) = \epsilon_m$.

Now the choice $M = \left\lceil \frac{\ln \frac{\Omega_1}{\epsilon}}{\ln \beta_{ds}} \right\rceil$ implies $\epsilon_M \leq \epsilon$. If $\theta = 1$, the total number of subgradient evaluations is

$$MK_1 \leq \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \kappa^2 \beta_{ds}^{\frac{1}{2}} \ln(3\beta_{ds}) \left(\frac{\ln \frac{\Omega_1}{\epsilon}}{\ln \beta_{ds}} + 1\right).$$

Further note that for $\theta = 1$, β_{ds} is a constant and can be chosen independently of κ and Ω_1, which implies (25).

If $\theta < 1$ the total number of subgradient evaluations is

$$\begin{aligned} K_1 + K_2 + \ldots_+ K_M &= K_1 \left(1 + \beta_{ds}^{\frac{1}{\theta}-1} + (\beta_{ds}^{\frac{1}{\theta}-1})^2 + \ldots + (\beta_{ds}^{\frac{1}{\theta-1}})^{M-1}\right) \\ &= K_1 \frac{(\beta_{ds}^{\frac{1}{\theta}-1})^M - 1}{\beta_{ds}^{\frac{1}{\theta}-1} - 1} \\ &\leq K_1 \frac{(\beta_{ds}^{\frac{1}{\theta}-1})^M}{\beta_{ds}^{\frac{1}{\theta}-1} - 1}. \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Now since

$$M \leq \frac{\ln \frac{\Omega_1}{\epsilon}}{\ln \beta_{ds}} + 1$$

it follows that

$$(\beta_{ds}^{\frac{1}{\theta}-1})^M \leq \beta_{ds}^{\frac{1}{\theta}-1} \left(\frac{\Omega_1}{\epsilon}\right)^{\frac{1}{\theta}-1}. \tag{31}$$

Also

$$K_1 \leq 2\theta \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2\theta}} \kappa^2 \beta_{ds}^{\frac{1}{2\theta}} \Omega_1^{1-\frac{1}{\theta}} \ln(3\beta_{ds}). \tag{32}$$

Using (31) and (32) in (30) yields

$$K_1 + K_2 + \ldots_+ K_M \leq \frac{2\theta \beta_{ds}^{\frac{1}{\theta}-1}}{\beta_{ds}^{\frac{1}{\theta}-1} - 1} \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2\theta}} \kappa^2 \beta_{ds}^{\frac{1}{2\theta}} \ln(3\beta_{ds}) \epsilon^{1-\frac{1}{\theta}}.$$

Now if β_{ds} satisfies (23) with equality then this reduces to (27).

6.2 Discussion

Regarding RSG [58], the iteration complexity is very similar to ours, even though the analysis is different. There are several points to note in comparing the two. First is that their error metric is $h(x) - h^*$. On the other hand our error metric is $d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2$. Furthermore their iteration complexity is for finding $h(x) - h^* \leq 2\epsilon$. To do a fair comparison, we can convert their error metric to $d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2$ by using $\epsilon' = 2^{-1}\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2\theta}}$ in their iteration complexity. As was mentioned their iteration complexity is $O(\epsilon'^{2(\theta-1)} \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon'})$. Thus, if we make the substitution, we see that their iteration complexity is the same as ours except they have an extra $\log \frac{1}{\epsilon}$ term. The dependence on $\kappa^2 = G^2/c^2$ is the same.

With respect to their algorithm implementation as given in [58, Algorithm 2], the major difference to DS-SG is that [58] requires averaging to be done after every inner loop. As mention before, this may be undesirable on problems where nonergodic methods are preferable. For instance, in problems where $\mathcal{C}$ enforces sparsity or low-rank, the averaging phase spoils this property [17]. Another situation in which averaging is undesirable is when learning with reproducing kernels [32]. In such problems, the variable is represented as a linear combination of a kernel evaluated at different points. After t iterations of the subgradient method, the solution is $\sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \alpha_i k(x_i, \cdot)$ where $k : \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{R}$ is the kernel function. Thus it is necessary to store the $t-1$ points $\{x_i\}$ after t iterations which is infeasible. The key to making the method practical is that for certain objectives the coefficients α_i decay geometrically and the early iterations can be safely ignored. Thus only a small fraction of the last t points are recorded. However, if averaging is used, the earlier coefficients are no longer negligible which compromises the feasibility of the method. Another advantage of our approach over [58] will arise in the next section, where we develop a method for adapting to unknown c.

7 Double Descending Stairs Stepsize Method for Unknown c

7.1 The Method

In our method DS-SG (Algorithm 2), the initial number of inner iterations is

$$K_1 = \left\lceil \frac{3^{\frac{1}{2\theta}} \theta G^2 \Omega_1^{1-\frac{1}{\theta}}}{2^{\frac{1}{2\theta}} c^2} \beta_{ds}^{\frac{1}{2\theta}} \ln(3\beta_{ds}) \right\rceil. \tag{33}$$

If a lower bound for c is known, then using this value in (33) ensures convergence. However in many problems c is unknown. Furthermore if c is greatly underestimated then this will lead to many more inner iterations than necessary. For the case where no accurate lower bound for c is known, we propose the following "doubling trick" which still guarantees essentially the same iteration complexity. The analysis only holds when $\mathcal{C}$ is bounded. Let the diameter of $\mathcal{C}$ be $\Omega_{\mathcal{C}} = \max_{x,x' \in \mathcal{C}} \|x - x'\|^2$. The basic idea is to repeat DS-SG with a

new c which is half the old estimate. In this way it takes only a logarithmic number of trial choices for c until it lower bounds the true constant. Furthermore, if the initial estimate c_1 is much larger than the true c, then the number of inner iterations is relatively small, which is why the overall iteration complexity comes out to be only a factor of (4/3) times larger than that of DS-SG. This means it is advantageous to use a large overestimate of c. In fact one can safely use the initial estimate $c_1 = G\Omega_{\mathcal{C}}^{1-\theta}$. Following the naming convention of [58] we call the method the "Double Descending Stairs" subgradient method (DS2-SG).

Algorithm 3: Double Descending Stairs subgradient method for $\theta = 1$, unknown c (DS2-SG)

Require: β_{ds}, G, M, c_1, $\Omega_{\mathcal{C}}, x_1$, *stopping criterion.*
1: $l = 1$
2: **while** *stopping criterion* not satisfied **do**
3: $\tilde{x}_l$ =DS-SG($\beta_{ds}, M, \tilde{x}_{l-1}, \Omega_{\mathcal{C}}, G, c_l, \theta$)
4: $c_{l+1} = c_l/2$
5: $l = l + 1$
6: **end while**
7: **return** $\tilde{x}_{l-1}$

Theorem 4 *Suppose Assumption 3 holds and $\theta \geq 1/2$. Suppose $\mathcal{C}$ is bounded with diameter $\Omega_{\mathcal{C}}$. Choose $\beta_{ds} > 1$ so that*

$$\beta_{ds} \geq \frac{1}{3} \max \left\{ \left(\frac{\kappa_1^2}{4} \right)^{\frac{\theta}{\theta-1}} \Omega_{\mathcal{C}}, 2\theta^{-2\theta} \kappa_1^{-4\theta} \Omega_{\mathcal{C}}^{2(1-\theta)} \right\} \tag{34}$$

where $\kappa_1 = G/c_1$. (Note that if $\theta = 1$ and $\kappa_1 \geq 1$, (34) reduces to the simple requirement that $\beta_{ds} > 1$.) Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and choose

$$M \geq \left\lceil \frac{\ln \frac{\Omega_{\mathcal{C}}}{\epsilon}}{\ln \beta_{ds}} \right\rceil. \tag{35}$$

For the output of Algorithm DS2-SG, if $l \geq L = \max\{0, \lceil \log_2 c_1/c \rceil\} + 1$, then $d(\tilde{x}_l, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 \leq \epsilon$. This requires the following number of subgradient evaluations:

$$O\left(\overline{\kappa}^2 \ln \frac{\Omega_{\mathcal{C}}}{\epsilon} \right) \text{ if } \theta = 1, \tag{36}$$

and

$$\tilde{O}\left(\max \left\{ \overline{\kappa}^2, \overline{\kappa}^2 \kappa_1^{\frac{1}{\theta-1}} \Omega_{\mathcal{C}}^{\frac{1}{2\theta}}, \left(\frac{\overline{\kappa}}{\kappa_1} \right)^2 \Omega_{\mathcal{C}}^{\frac{1}{\theta}-1} \right\} \epsilon^{1-\frac{1}{\theta}} \right) \text{ if } \theta < 1, \tag{37}$$

where $\overline{\kappa} = \max\{\kappa, \kappa_1\}$ and $\kappa_1 = G/c_1$. If $c_1 = G\Omega_{\mathcal{C}}^{1-\frac{1}{\theta}}$, $\kappa_1 \leq \kappa$ and $\overline{\kappa} = \kappa$.

Proof If $c_l \leq c$, for any $l \leq L$ then, $d(\tilde{x}_l, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 \leq \epsilon$ by Theorem 3. So we assume $c_l > c$ for $l = 1, 2 \ldots, L-1$. For $l < L$ it is clear that since the iterates remain in the constraint set $\mathcal{C}$, $d(\tilde{x}_l, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 \leq \Omega_{\mathcal{C}}$. Now by the choice of L, $c_l \leq c$ for all $l \geq L$. Therefore we can apply Theorem 3 to the iterations within the while loop when $l \geq L$, which implies $d(\tilde{x}_l, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 \leq \epsilon$ for $l \geq L$. Note that, since the R.H.S. of (34) decreases if you replace c_1 with a smaller error bound constant, β_{ds} will satisfy (23) with c_l in place of c.

We now determine the overall iteration complexity. let K_j^l for $l = 1, 2, \ldots, L$ and $j = 1, 2, \ldots M$ be the number of iterations passed to FixedSG within the jth call to FixedSG in DS-SG, during the lth loop in DS2-SG. The total number of subgradient calls of DS2-SG is

$$\begin{aligned}
&(K_1^1 + K_2^1 + \ldots K_M^1) + (K_1^2 + K_2^2 + \ldots K_M^2) + \ldots (K_1^L + K_2^L + \ldots + K_M^L) \\
&= (K_1^1 + K_2^1 + \ldots K_M^1)\left(1 + 4 + 16 + \ldots + 4^{L-1}\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{3}(K_1^1 + K_2^1 + \ldots K_M^1)(4^L - 1) \\
&= \frac{4}{3}(K_1^1 + K_2^1 + \ldots K_M^1) \max\left\{\left(\frac{c_1}{c}\right)^2, 1\right\},
\end{aligned}$$

which reduces to the iteration complexity given in (36)–(37).

Now

$$cd(x, \mathcal{X})^{\frac{1}{\theta}} \leq h(x) - h^* \leq \|g\|\|x - x^*\|$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{C}$, $g \in \partial h(x)$, and $x^* \in \mathcal{X}_h$. Therefore, let $x^* = \text{proj}_{\mathcal{X}_h}(x)$ then

$$cd(x, \mathcal{X})^{\frac{1}{\theta}} \leq Gd(x, \mathcal{X}) \implies c \leq Gd(x, \mathcal{X})^{1-\frac{1}{\theta}} \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{C}.$$

Minimizing the R.H.S. yields $c \leq G\Omega_{\mathcal{C}}^{1-\frac{1}{\theta}}$. Therefore the choice $c_1 = G\Omega_{\mathcal{C}}^{1-\frac{1}{\theta}}$ guarantees $\kappa_1 \leq \kappa$.

7.2 Discussion

The competing methods for $\theta = 1$ which also obtain a $O(\log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ complexity cannot handle unknown c. This is the major advantage of DS2-SG. The authors of RSG [58] proposed a variant, R^{2}SG, which can adapt to unknown c when $\theta < 1$. It also uses exponentially increasing number of inner iterations, however the initial stepsize remains the same. An advantage of that method is it does not require the constraint set to be bounded. Since their analysis is only valid for $\theta < 1$, it cannot be directly applied to important problems such as polyhedral convex optimization, and requires using a surrogate $\theta < 1$.

A drawback of DS2-SG is it does not have an explicit stopping rule. In particular, the number of "wrapper" iterations, L, depends on the true error bound constant c, which is unknown. This is also the main drawback of R^{2}SG [58] (along with the fact it cannot be applied when $\theta = 1$). As was suggested in [58], we suggest using an independent stopping criterion. For example on a machine learning problem, one could use the error on a small validation set

as an indication the algorithm has converged. If a lower bound $h_{LB} \leq h^*$ is known, then $c^{-\theta}\left(h(x_k) - h_{LB}\right)^{\theta}$ can be used as a stopping criterion. This is because $d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h) \leq c^{-\theta}\left(h(x_k) - h_{LB}\right)^{\theta}$. Furthermore since, $cd(x_k, \mathcal{X})^{\frac{1}{\theta}-1} \leq \|g\|$ for $g \in \partial h(x)$, the norm of the subgradient could be used as a stopping criterion for $\theta < 1$. Another possibility is to use the fact that $cd(x_k, \mathcal{X}) \leq \|g\|^{\theta}\Omega_{\mathcal{C}}^{\theta}$. Exploring these stopping criteria is a topic for future work.

In practice for DS2-SG, we often observe an increase in the objective function value whenever a new trial error bound constant is used. It is therefore a good strategy to keep track of the iterate $\tilde{x}_l$ with the smallest objective function value so far. This does not change the overall iteration complexity and only requires storing one additional iterate.

8 Convergence Rates for Nonsummable Stepsizes

We now turn our attention to nonsummable but square summable stepsize sequences for the subgradient method under HEB. These stepsizes are used frequently for the stochastic and deterministic subgradient method, however their behavior under HEB has not been studied in detail with the exception of [35,51]. We will see that these nonsummable stepsizes are slower than the "descending stairs" stepsizes and summable stepsizes when $\theta > 1/2$. However, in this case the nonsummable stepsizes have the advantage that they do not require G, c, and Ω_1. We will first state and discuss our results. The proofs are in Section 11.

8.1 Results for $\theta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$

Theorem 5 *Suppose Assumption 3 holds and $0 < \theta < 1/2$. Let $\alpha_k = \alpha_1 k^{-p}$. Let*

$$C_1 \triangleq 2^{2p\theta+1}\left(\left(\frac{\alpha_1 G^2}{c}\right)^{2\theta} + \alpha_1^2 G^2\right) \tag{38}$$

$$C_2 \triangleq \left(\frac{\alpha_1(1-2\theta)}{2\theta(1-p)}\right)^{\frac{2\theta}{2\theta-1}}.$$

Then if

$$\frac{1}{2(1-\theta)} \leq p \leq 1 \tag{39}$$

and α_1 is chosen so that

$$C_1 \leq \left(\frac{2\theta(1-p)}{\alpha_1(1-2\theta)}\right)^{\frac{2\theta}{1-2\theta}} (k_0+1)^{\frac{2\theta(2p(1-\theta)-1)}{1-2\theta}}, \tag{40}$$

$$\alpha_1 \leq \frac{2\theta(1-p)d(x_1, \mathcal{X}_h)^{\frac{2\theta-1}{\theta}}}{1-2\theta}, \tag{41}$$

then for all $k \geq k_0$

$$d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 \leq \max\{C_1, C_2\} \max\left\{k^{-2p\theta}, k^{\frac{2\theta(1-p)}{2\theta-1}}\right\}. \tag{42}$$

Proof Sec. 11.

In the following corollary we give the optimal choice for p that makes the two arguments to the max function in (42) equal.

Corollary 1 *In the setting of Theorem 5 with* $0 < \theta < \frac{1}{2}$ *and* C_1 *defined in (38), if* $p = \frac{1}{2(1-\theta)}$*, and* α_1 *is chosen so that (41) holds and*

$$\alpha_1^{\frac{2\theta}{1-2\theta}} C_1 \leq \left(\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}\right)^{\frac{2\theta}{1-2\theta}} \tag{43}$$

then for all $k \geq 1$

$$d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 \leq \alpha_1^{\frac{2\theta}{2\theta-1}} \left(\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}\right)^{\frac{2\theta}{1-2\theta}} k^{\frac{-\theta}{1-\theta}}.$$

If α_1 *is chosen so that (43) is satisfied with equality, then*

$$d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 \leq C_1 k^{\frac{-\theta}{1-\theta}}.$$

Proof Sec. 11.

As mentioned in the introduction, our derived convergence rate $O(k^{\frac{-\theta}{1-\theta}})$ is faster than the naive application of the classical result, which is $d(\hat{x}_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 = O(k^{-\theta})$ at the averaged point $\hat{x}_k = \sum \alpha_k x_k / \sum \alpha_k$. Furthermore our result is nonergodic (no averaging is required). Thus we see that for $\theta < 1/2$ decaying polynomial stepsize sequences can achieve the same convergence rate as RSG [58] and the constant stepsize we derived in Theorem 2.

8.2 Results for $\theta \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$

We now consider nonsummable stepsizes for $\theta \geq 1/2$. The primary advantage of the following stepsize is that it does not require knowledge of G, c, or $d(x_1, \mathcal{X})^2$.

Theorem 6 *Suppose Assumption 3 holds and* $1/2 \leq \theta \leq 1$*. Suppose* $\alpha_k = \alpha_1 k^{-p}$ *for some* $p \in (0, 1)$ *and* $\alpha_1 > 0$*. Let* C_1 *be as defined in (38),*

$$C_3 \triangleq C_1^{\frac{1+2p(\theta-1)}{1-p}} \left(\frac{\alpha_1(1-2^{p-1})ce}{4p\theta}\right)^{-\frac{2p\theta}{1-p}}$$

$$C_4 \triangleq 16 \left(\frac{8\theta C_1}{\alpha_1 ce}\right)^{2\theta}$$

$$C_5 \triangleq d(x_1, \mathcal{X}_h)^{\frac{2+4p(\theta-1)}{1-p}} \left(\frac{\alpha_1 ce}{4p\theta}\right)^{-\frac{2p\theta}{1-p}}.$$

Then for all $k \geq 4$

$$d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 \leq 4 \max\{C_1, C_3, C_4, C_5\} k^{-2p\theta}. \tag{44}$$

Proof Sec. 11.

Once again this improves on the known classical *ergodic* convergence rate of $O(k^{-\theta})$. As $p \to 1$ the method can get arbitrarily close to the best rate $O(k^{-2\theta})$, however $p = 1$ is not covered by our analysis other than the special case $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$ discussed in Theorem 7 and Proposition 2 below. The decaying stepsize does not require knowledge of θ, c, G, h^*, or $d(x_1, \mathcal{X}_h)$ to set the parameters α_1 and p. The result holds for arbitrary $\alpha_1 > 0$ and $p \in (0, 1)$. Nevertheless, the constants are affected by the choice of α_1 and p as well as practical performance.

The convergence rate for the decaying stepsizes is much slower than DS-SG, the summable stepsizes in Sec. 9, and RSG [58]. These methods obtain the rate $O\left(k^{\frac{\theta}{\theta-1}}\right)$ for $\theta > 1/2$.

The case $\theta = 1$ in Theorem 6 can be compared with the main result of [35] which also proves $O(1/k^2)$ rate of convergence for $d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2$. A difference is their result only holds for sufficiently large k. They also assume the function satisfies the quadratic growth condition (i.e. $\theta = 1/2$ error bound) globally. For problems where $\mathcal{C}$ is compact, this does not matter, since QG is implied by WS on a compact set. An advantage of [35] is that it holds for stochastic gradient descent.

8.3 Results for $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$

For the special case of $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$ our analysis extends to the choice $p = 1$.

Theorem 7 *Suppose Assumption 3 holds and* $\theta = 1/2$. *Suppose* $\alpha_k = \alpha_1 k^{-1}$ *and*

$$\alpha_1 \leq \frac{1}{c}.$$

Then for $k \geq 1$

$$d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 \leq \max\left\{\frac{2\alpha_1 G^2}{c}, d(x_1, \mathcal{X}_h)^2\right\} k^{-c\alpha_1}. \tag{45}$$

Proof Sec. 11.

Strongly convex functions with strong convexity parameter μ_{sc} satisfy the error bound with $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$ and $c = \frac{\mu_{sc}}{2}$. In this case $C_1 = \frac{8G^2}{c^2}$. Thus, for the choice $\alpha_1 = \frac{2}{\mu_{sc}}$ we have proved that

$$d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 \leq \frac{1}{k} \max\left\{d(x_1, \mathcal{X}_h)^2, \frac{32G^2}{\mu_{sc}^2}\right\}.$$

This result can be compared with several papers. The result [11, Theorem 6.2] finds an $O(1/k)$ convergence rate for $h(\hat{x}_k) - h^*$ for a particular averaged point $\hat{x}_k$ under strong convexity. This, combined with HEB implies an $O(1/k)$ rate for $d(\hat{x}_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2$. The work [41, Thm 1] obtained a nonergodic $O(1/k)$ rate for $d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2$ in stochastic mirror descent under strong convexity for a similar stepsize sequence to Theorem 7. The result [39, Prop. 2.8] provides convergence rates for the (incremental) subgradient method with stepsize $\alpha_k = \alpha_1 k^{-1}$ for all values of α_1 under QG. This is more general than Theorem 7 as they cover the case where $\alpha_1 > 1/c$. However, for $\alpha_1 = 1/c$, [39, Prop. 2.8] only proves $O(\log k/k)$ convergence whereas Theorem 7 implies $O(1/k)$ convergence. The result of [42, Eq. (2.9)] says that for strongly convex functions with parameter μ_{sc}, the subgradient method achieves a nonergodic $O(1/k)$ convergence so long as $\alpha_1 > \frac{1}{2\mu_{sc}}$. In contrast we do not require strong convexity but only the weaker error bound. The result can also be compared to [31, Thm. 4] which proved an $O(1/k)$ rate for the objective function gap under QG. However they additionally require Lipschitz smoothness. Both [42] and [31] considered the stochastic subgradient method.

We also provide another choice of stepsize which guarantees a convergence rate of $O(1/k)$ for $d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2$ in the case where $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$. This proof is a direct adaptation of [31, Thm. 4]. Unlike [31, Thm. 4], it does not require smoothness of the objective.

Proposition 2 *In the setting of Theorem 7, consider the subgradient method with*

$$\alpha_k = \frac{2k+1}{2c(k+1)^2}.$$

Then for all k

$$d(x_{k+1}, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 \leq \frac{d(x_1, \mathcal{X}_h)^2}{(k+1)^2} + \frac{G^2}{c^2(k+1)}.$$

Proof Sec. 11.

9 Faster Rates for Decaying Stepsizes When the Problem Parameters are Known

If $\theta < 1$, an upper bound for G is known and a lower bound for c is known, then it is possible to obtain the same iteration complexity as DS-SG using decaying stepsizes. The analysis is different for $\theta < 1/2$ and $\theta \geq 1/2$ and we first consider the latter. In this case we also require the constraint set $\mathcal{C}$ to be compact.

Theorem 8 *Suppose Assumption 3 holds and $\frac{1}{2} \leq \theta < 1$. Suppose $\|x - y\|^2 \leq \Omega_{\mathcal{C}}$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{C}$. Choose c small enough (or G large enough) so that*

$$\kappa \geq \sqrt{3}\Omega_{\mathcal{C}}^{\frac{1-\theta}{2\theta}}. \tag{46}$$

For the iterates of the subgradient method (2), let $\alpha_k = \alpha_1 k^{-p}$ *where*

$$p = \frac{1}{2(1-\theta)}$$

and

$$\alpha_1 = \frac{c}{G^2}\left(\frac{\theta\kappa^2}{1-\theta}\right)^p. \tag{47}$$

Then, for all $k \geq \lceil \frac{2\theta}{1-\theta} \rceil$

$$d(x_k, \mathcal{X})^2 \leq \left(\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}\right)^{\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}} \left(\frac{k}{\kappa^2}\right)^{\frac{\theta}{\theta-1}}. \tag{48}$$

Proof The recursion describing the subgradient method is, for $k \geq 1$,

$$e_{k+1} \leq e_k - 2\alpha_k c e_k^{\gamma} + \alpha_k^2 G^2, \tag{49}$$

where $e_k = d(x_k, \mathcal{X})^2$ and $\gamma = \frac{1}{2\theta}$. Let $\alpha_k = \alpha_1 k^{-p}$. We wish to prove that if

$$p = \frac{\gamma}{2\gamma - 1}$$

and the constant α_1 is chosen as in (47), then

$$e_k \leq C_e k^{-b} \tag{50}$$

where

$$b \triangleq \frac{p}{\gamma} = \frac{1}{2\gamma - 1},$$

for all $k \geq k_0 \triangleq \lceil 2b \rceil$, and C_e is given by $C_e = (\kappa^2 b)^b$.

We will prove this result by induction. The initial condition is

$$e_{k_0} \leq C_e k_0^{-b}$$

which is implied by

$$\Omega_{\mathcal{C}} \leq C_e k_0^{-b} \iff C_e = (\kappa^2 b)^b \geq \Omega_{\mathcal{C}} k_0^b. \tag{51}$$

Since $k_0 = \lceil 2b \rceil \leq 2b + 1 \leq 3b$, this is implied by

$$\left(b\kappa^2\right)^b \geq \Omega_{\mathcal{C}} (3b)^b.$$

Diving by b^b and taking the bth root yields

$$\kappa^2 \geq 3\Omega_{\mathcal{C}}^{\frac{1}{b}},$$

which is (46).

Next, assume (50) is true for some $k \geq k_0$. That is, assume $e_k = aC_e k^{-b}$, where $0 \leq a \leq 1$. We will show that this implies $e_{k+1} \leq C_e(k+1)^{-b}$. Substituting $e_k = aC_e k^{-b}$ and $\alpha_k = \alpha_1 k^{-p}$ into the right hand side of (49) yields

$$\begin{aligned} e_{k+1} &\leq aC_e k^{-b} - 2\alpha_1 c a^\gamma C_e^\gamma k^{-(p+\gamma b)} + \alpha_1^2 G^2 k^{-2p} \\ &= aC_e k^{-b} + \left(\alpha_1^2 G^2 - 2\alpha_1 c a^\gamma C_e^\gamma\right) k^{-2p} \end{aligned}$$

using the fact that $p + \gamma b = 2p$. Thus we wish to enforce the inequality:

$$aC_e k^{-b} + \left(\alpha_1^2 G^2 - 2\alpha_1 c a^\gamma C_e^\gamma\right) k^{-2p} \leq C_e(k+1)^{-b}. \tag{52}$$

We need (52) to hold for all $a \in [0,1]$. Since $\frac{1}{2} \leq \theta < 1$, $\frac{1}{2} < \gamma \leq 1$, therefore the L.H.S. is a convex function of a for $a \geq 0$. Therefore if the inequality holds for $a = 0$ and $a = 1$, then it holds for all $a \in [0,1]$.

Consider first, $a = 0$. The condition is

$$\alpha_1^2 G^2 k^{-2\gamma b} \leq C_e(k+1)^{-b}.$$

This is equivalent to

$$\alpha_1 \leq G^{-1} C_e^{\frac{1}{2}} k^{\gamma b}(k+1)^{-\frac{b}{2}}. \tag{53}$$

Note that α_1, given in (47), can be rewritten as

$$\alpha_1 = \frac{cC_e^\gamma}{G^2}.$$

Substituting α_1 into (53) yields

$$\frac{c}{G^2} C_e^\gamma \leq G^{-1} C_e^{\frac{1}{2}} k^{\gamma b}(k+1)^{-\frac{b}{2}}$$

which can be rearranged to

$$G \geq c C_e^{\gamma - \frac{1}{2}} k^{-\gamma b}(k+1)^{\frac{b}{2}}. \tag{54}$$

Now

$$C_e^{\frac{2\gamma-1}{2}} = \kappa\sqrt{b}.$$

Substituting this into (54) yields

$$k^{\gamma b}(k+1)^{-\frac{b}{2}} \geq \sqrt{b}. \tag{55}$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} (k+1)^{-\frac{b}{2}} &= k^{-\frac{b}{2}}(1+k^{-1})^{-\frac{b}{2}} \\ &\geq k^{-\frac{b}{2}}\left(1 - \frac{b}{2}k^{-1}\right) \\ &= k^{-\frac{b}{2}} - \frac{b}{2}k^{-\frac{b}{2}-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore (55) is implied by

$$k^{b(\gamma-\frac{1}{2})} - \frac{b}{2}k^{b(\gamma-\frac{1}{2})-1} \geq \sqrt{b}.$$

Now substituting $b = (2\gamma-1)^{-1}$ into the two exponents yields

$$k^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{b}{2}k^{-\frac{1}{2}} \geq \sqrt{b}$$

which is equivalent to

$$t^2 - \sqrt{b}t - \frac{b}{2} \geq 0$$

with the substitution $t = \sqrt{k}$. Thus we require

$$t \geq \frac{1+\sqrt{3}}{2}\sqrt{b}$$

which is implied by $k \geq 2b$. Thus $k \geq \lceil 2b \rceil$ implies (52) holds with $a = 0$.

Now consider $a = 1$ in (52). We again simplify (52) using

$$C_e(k+1)^{-b} = C_e k^{-b}(1+k^{-1})^{-b} \geq C_e k^{-b} - bC_e k^{-(b+1)}.$$

Therefore in the case $a = 1$, (52) is implied by

$$\left(\alpha_1^2 G^2 - 2\alpha_1 c C_e^{\gamma}\right) k^{-2p} \leq -bC_e k^{-(b+1)}. \tag{56}$$

Now $2p = b+1$, therefore (56) is equivalent to

$$\alpha_1^2 G^2 - 2\alpha_1 c C_e^{\gamma} + bC_e \leq 0$$

for all $k \geq 1$. The L.H.S. is a positive-definite quadratic in α_1. Solving it yields the two solutions

$$\frac{2cC_e^{\gamma} \pm \sqrt{4c^2 C_e^{2\gamma} - 4G^2 bC_e}}{2G^2}.$$

The quadratic has a real solution if

$$4c^2 C_e^{2\gamma} - 4G^2 bC_e \geq 0 \iff C_e \geq \left(\kappa^2 b\right)^b. \tag{57}$$

Thus since $C_e = (\kappa^2 b)^b$, the only valid choice for α_1 is

$$\alpha_1 = \frac{cC_e^{\gamma}}{G^2}$$

which corresponds to (47). This completes the proof.

The convergence rate given in (48) yields the following iteration complexity: The subgradient method with this stepsize yields a point such that $d(x_k, \mathcal{X})^2 \leq \epsilon$ for all

$$k \geq \frac{2\theta}{1-\theta} \max\{\kappa^2, 3\Omega_{\mathcal{C}}^{\frac{1}{\theta}-1}\}\epsilon^{1-\frac{1}{\theta}}.$$

This is equal (up to constants) to the iteration complexity derived for DS-SG in Theorem 3. The main drawback versus DS-SG is that the analysis only holds for a bounded constraint set. It is trivial to embed this stepsize into the "doubling" framework used in DS2-SG so that one does not need a lower bound for c. Since the analysis is the same as given in Theorem 4, we omit the details.

The proof of Theorem 8 is inspired by [27] which considered geometrically decaying stepsizes when $\theta = 1$. Theorem 8 could be considered a natural extension of [27] to $\theta < 1$.

We can obtain the same rate for the choice of α_1 and p in Theorem 8 when $\theta < 1/2$. In this case, the convergence rate holds for all $k \geq 2$ under a slightly different condition on κ.

Theorem 9 *Suppose Assumption 3 holds and* $0 < \theta < \frac{1}{2}$. *Suppose* $\|x-y\|^2 \leq \Omega_{\mathcal{C}}$ *for all* $x, y \in \mathcal{C}$. *Choose* c *small enough (or* G *large enough) so that*

$$\kappa^2 \geq \frac{2(1-\theta)}{\theta}\Omega_{\mathcal{C}}^{\frac{1-\theta}{\theta}}. \tag{58}$$

For the iterates of the subgradient method (2), let $\alpha_k = \alpha_1 k^{-p}$ *where*

$$p = \frac{1}{2(1-\theta)}$$

and α_1 *be defined as in (47). Then, for all* $k \geq 2$, $d(x_k, \mathcal{X})^2$ *satisfies (48).*

Proof Recall $\gamma = 1/(2\theta)$ and note that $\gamma > 1$ since $\theta < 1/2$. Recall

$$b = \frac{1}{2\gamma - 1} \leq 1 \text{ and } p = \gamma b.$$

As with the proof of Theorem 8, this will be a proof by induction. We wish to prove that $e_k \leq C_e k^{-b}$ for all $k \geq 2$ for the constant defined as $C_e = \left(\kappa^2 b\right)^b$. The initial condition is $e_2 \leq C_e 2^{-b}$ which is implied by $C_e \geq \Omega_{\mathcal{C}} 2^b$. This in turn is implied by (58).

Now we assume $e_k = aC_e k^{-b}$ for some $k \geq 2$ and $a \in [0,1]$ and will show that $e_{k+1} \leq C_e(k+1)^{-b}$. Using the inductive assumption in the main recursion (49) yields the following inequality, which we would like to enforce for all $a \in [0,1]$:

$$\begin{aligned} e_{k+1} &\leq aC_e k^{-b} + \left(\alpha_1^2 G^2 - 2\alpha_1 c a^\gamma C_e^\gamma\right) k^{-2p} \\ &\leq C_e(k+1)^{-b}, \end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

where we once again used the fact that $p + \gamma b = 2p$. We require (59) to hold for all $a \in [0, 1]$. The L.H.S. is concave in a (since $\gamma > 1$), so we will compute the maximizer w.r.t. a. Let $D_1 = \alpha_1^2 G^2 k^{-2p}$, $D_2 = C_e k^{-b}$, and $D_3 = 2\alpha_1 c C_e^\gamma k^{-2\gamma b}$. Then let

$$f(a) = D_1 + D_2 a - D_3 a^\gamma$$

which is the L.H.S. of (59). Let a_* be the solution to

$$0 = f'(a_*) = D_2 - \gamma D_3 a_*^{\gamma-1},$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} a_* &= \left(\frac{D_2}{\gamma D_3}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \\ &= C_e^{-1}(2\alpha_1\gamma c)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} k^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} = C_e^{-1} D_4 \alpha_1^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} k^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \end{aligned}$$

where $D_4 = (2\gamma c)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}}$. But recall that $a \in [0, 1]$ therefore the maximizer of $f(a)$ in $[0, 1]$ is given by

$$\min\left\{1, C_e^{-1} D_4 \alpha_1^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} k^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}\right\}.$$

Thus if

$$k \geq (C_e D_4^{-1})^{\gamma-1} \alpha_1 \tag{60}$$

then the maximizer in $[0, 1]$ is equal to 1. Substituting the values for α_1 and C_e into (60) yields

$$k \geq (C_e D_4^{-1})^{\gamma-1} \frac{c}{G^2} C_e^\gamma = \frac{2\gamma}{2\gamma - 1}.$$

Since $\gamma > 1$ this is implied by $k \geq 2$. Thus we only need to consider $a = 1$ in (59).

The analysis with $a = 1$ substituted into (59) was carried out in the proof of Theorem 8. Recall that for this choice of stepsize and constant, the inequality (59) is satisfied with $a = 1$ for all $k \geq 1$, which completes the proof.

10 Numerical Experiments

In this section we present simulations to demonstrate some of the theoretical findings in this manuscript. We consider two examples satisfying HEB(c, θ) with $\theta = 1$ to test our proposed descending stairs stepsize choice in DS-SG and our "double descending stairs" method for unknown c, DS2-SG.

10.1 Least-Absolute Deviations Regression

Consider the following problem:

$$\min_x \|Ex - b\|_1 : \quad \|x\|_1 \leq \tau. \tag{61}$$

This objective function is often used in regression problems and in machine learning [28,55,54,25]. Besides the subgradient techniques considered in this manuscript, there are a few other methods which can tackle Prob. (61). The problem can be written as a linear program and solved via any LP solver. A popular option is an interior point method. These are second order methods that rely on computing second order information and solving potentially large linear systems at each iteration. In general they are not competitive with subgradient methods on large scale problems. Simplex methods [4] are another option. While their typical performance is good, these methods have exponential computational complexity in the worst case. The alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM) is another approach to solving Prob. (61), however it involves solving a quadratic program at each iteration, placing it in the same complexity class as the interior point methods [21]. The primal-dual splitting method of [15] is a first-order method which can tackle Prob. (61). The main drawback of the method is that one must know the largest singular value of E in order to choose the stepsizes correctly. As such, it is not directly comparable with the subgradient methods developed in this manuscript which do not require this information. The paper [55] introduces a method for solving Prob. (61) which is similar to the LARS method for solving the LASSO [22]. The method solves Prob. (61) for an increasing sequence of τ. At every iteration it solves a linear system, using the previous solution in a smart way. However, as far as we are aware, the iteration complexity of this method is unknown. Edgeworth's algorithm is a coordinate descent method for Prob. (61) which has shown promising empirical performance [56]. However unlike the subgradient methods considered here, the method is not guaranteed to converge to a minimizer. In fact specific examples exist where Edgeworth's algorithm converges to a non-optimal point [34].

Problem (61) is a polyhedral optimization problem therefore HEB(c, θ) is satisfied for all x with $\theta = 1$ [58]. However, it is not easy to compute c. Note that the constraint set is compact thus DS2-SG is applicable. Projection onto the ℓ_1 ball can be done in linear time in expectation via the method of [20].

To test the subgradient methods we first consider a random instance of Problem (61). We set $m = 100$ and $n = 50$ and construct E of size $m \times n$ with i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ entries. We construct b of size $m \times 1$ with i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ entries. We set $\tau = 1$. All tested algorithms were initialized to the same point.

To start we test the convergence rates predicted by Theorem 6 for decaying stepsizes. We consider two stepsizes $\alpha_k = 0.1k^{-0.99}$, and $\alpha_k = 0.01k^{-0.5}$, where the constants were tuned to achieve good performance. In Fig. 1 we plot the log of $d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2$ versus $\log_{10} k$, where k is the number of iterations. An optimal solution x^* is estimated by running DS-SG until it converges to



Fig. 1 Problem (61): Log of square distance to the (unique) solution vs log of number of subgradient evaluations for two decaying stepsizes.

within numerical precision. Looking at the figure it appears that for $k > 1000$ the convergence rates are as predicted in Theorem 6. Specifically for the first parameter choice, $d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 \approx O(k^{-1.98})$ and for the second $d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 \approx O(k^{-1})$.

Next we test the performance of DS-SG, RSG [58], and Shor's method of [50, Sec. 2.3] (which is very similar to Goffin's stepsize [27]), alongside the two decaying stepsizes discussed in Fig. 1. For DS-SG we used $\beta_{ds} = 4$, $\epsilon = 10^{-5}$, $\Omega_{\mathcal{C}} = 4\tau^2$, and $G = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|E_i\|$ where E_i is the ith column of E. For the other methods we chose the parameters in the way suggested by the authors. Since c is difficult to estimate, we tuned it to get the best performance in each algorithm (see below for our approach, DS2-SG, which does not need c). For DS-SG, RSG, and Shor's algorithm, these were $c = 22, 15$, and 11 respectively.

The log of $d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2$ for each of these algorithms is plotted in Fig. 2 versus the number k of subgradient evaluations. Fig. 2 confirms that DS-SG has a linear convergence rate, verifying Theorem 3. It's performance is very similar to Shor's method. While RSG does appear to obtain linear convergence, it's rate is slower than DS-SG and Shor's method.

As was mentioned we had to tune c to get good performance of DS-SG, RSG, and Shor's method. We now compare these three methods with our proposed 'doubling trick' variant DS2-SG, which does not need the value of c. We also compare with the method R^{2}SG proposed in [58]. Note that this method only works for $\theta < 1$ so following the advice of [58], we use the approximate value of $\hat{\theta} = 0.8$, which was chosen because it performed well. We initialize DS2-SG with the same parameters as DS-SG but with $c_1 = G = 160$. To demonstrate the effect of poorly chosen c in DS-SG, RSG, and Shor's method, we set $c = 100$ for all these methods (recall the tuned values were smaller). The results are given in Fig. 3. We compare function values and for each algorithm we keep track of the iterate with the smallest function value so far. We



Fig. 2 Problem (61): Log of square distance to the (unique) solution vs number of subgradient evaluations for DS-SG, RSG, and two decaying stepsizes.



Fig. 3 Problem (61): Log of $h(x) - h^*$ vs number of subgradient evaluations for DS-SG, RSG, and Shor's method all with $c = 100$, R^{2}SG, DS2-SG with the initial $c_1 = G = 160$, and two decaying stepsizes.

see that DS-SG, RSG, and Shor's method converge to suboptimal solutions due to the incorrect value of c. However DS2-SG finds the correct solution to within an objective function error of 10^{-10}. R^{2}SG has slower convergence, which is not surprising since it is not guaranteed to obtain linear convergence when $\theta = 1$. It is also encouraging that DS2-SG is faster than the decaying stepsizes $\alpha_k = O(k^{-1})$ and $\alpha_k = O(k^{-0.5})$, since this choice also does not require knowledge of c.



Fig. 4 Problem (61) applied to space.ga dataset: Log of $h(x) - h^*$ vs number of subgradient evaluations for DS-SG, $\alpha_k = k^{-1}$, and $\alpha_k = 0.1k^{-0.5}$.

10.2 Least-Absolute Deviations Regression on the "space.ga" Dataset

We also apply Prob. (61) on a real dataset. We use the normalized space.ga dataset downloaded from the *libsvm* website.[1] We use a subset of the dataset with $m = 100$ and $n = 6$, and set $\tau = 5$.

Since c is unknown, we compare subgradient methods which do not require it. Thus we compare two decaying stepsizes, $\alpha_k = k^{-1}$ and $\alpha_k = 0.1k^{-0.5}$, and DS2-SG. Note that R^{2}SG also does not require c but we could not tune it to be competitive on this problem. For DS2-SG, we estimate $G = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|E_i\|$ and $\Omega_{\mathcal{C}} = 4\tau^2$ as in the synthetic experiment. We use $\beta_{ds} = 2$ and $\epsilon = 10^{-12}$. The objective function vs iteration-number is plotted in Fig. 4. One can see that the decaying stepsizes are faster than DS2-SG in the early iterations but DS2-SG is much faster in the later iterations. The decaying stepsizes were highly sensitive to the choice of α_1 which had to be tuned. On the other hand DS-SG was effected by the choice of β_{ds}. Smaller values of β_{ds} lead to better performance early-on, while larger values give better convergence in the latter iterations. In general $\beta_{ds} \in [1.5, 4]$ worked well in all of our experiments.

10.3 Sparse SVM

The ℓ_1-regularized Support Vector Machine (SVM) Problem [62] is

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \max\{0, 1 - y_i c_i^\top x\} + \rho \|x\|_1$$

[1] `https://www.csie.ntu.edu.tw/~cjlin/libsvmtools/datasets/`.

for a dataset $\{c_i, y_i\}_{i=1}^m$ with $c_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $y_i \in \{\pm 1\}$. We will consider the equivalent constrained version

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \max\{0, 1 - y_i c_i^\top x\} : \|x\|_1 \leq \tau. \tag{62}$$

Since the objective function is polyhedral it satisfies HEB with $\theta = 1$ for some unknown $c > 0$. Once again since c is unknown, we only consider DS2-SG, R^{2}SG [58], and the following decaying stepsizes: $\alpha_k = 0.1k^{-1}$ and $\alpha_k = 0.01k^{-0.5}$, where the constants 0.1 and 0.01 were tuned to give fast convergence. R^{2}SG only works for $\theta < 1$ so cannot be directly applied to this problem. Instead we selected $\hat{\theta} < 1$ which gave the fastest convergence. Surprisingly, $\hat{\theta} = 0.5$ performed the best even though one might expect $\hat{\theta} \approx 1$ to perform better. For DS2-SG we initialize with $c_1 = G$ where $G = \sum_{i=1}^m \|c_i\|$. We used $\beta_{ds} = 2$, $\epsilon = 10^{-5}$, and $\Omega_{\mathcal{C}} = 4\tau^2$. All four algorithms had the same starting point.

A random instance of Prob. (62) was generated as follows: $n = 50, m = 100$, the entries of c_i are drawn from $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, the $y_i = \pm 1$ with equal probability, and $\tau = 2$. The results are plotted in Fig. 5. We see that our proposal, DS2-SG, outperforms the others.

10.4 Sparse SVM on the "glass.scale" Dataset

To test Prob. (62) on real data, we download the *glass.scale* dataset from the libsvm website. For this dataset, $n = 9$ and $m = 214$. There are 6 different labels so we group labels "1", "2", and "3" together into class: $y = -1$, and labels "5", "6", and "7" into class: $y = 1$. We solve Prob. (62) with $\tau = 2$.

Again we compare the subgradient methods which do not require c, namely DS2-SG, R^{2}SG, and two decaying stepsizes. For DS2-SG we use the same parameters as in the synthetic experiment, except $\beta_{ds} = 4$ and $\epsilon = 10^{-8}$. The objective function vs iteration-number is plotted in Figure 6. Once again we see that DS2-SG outperforms the two decaying stepsizes as well as R^{2}SG.

10.5 Extensions

The key recursion (6) can also be derived in the following situations: 1) when a small amount of noise is added to the subgradient, 2) for the incremental subgradient method, and 3) under a more general condition than HEB, introduced by Goffin [27]. We now discuss each of these.

10.6 Deterministic Noise in the Subgradient when $\theta = 1$

For the weakly sharp case ($\theta = 1$), the subgradient method exhibits resilience to bounded noise. This has been observed in [40,45]. Suppose that at each



Fig. 5 Problem (62) with randomly generated data: Log of $h(x) - h^*$ vs number of subgradient evaluations for DS2-SG, R^{2}SG, and two decaying stepsizes.



Fig. 6 Problem (62) for the "glass.scale" dataset: Log of $h(x) - h^*$ vs number of subgradient evaluations for DS2-SG, R^{2}SG, and two decaying stepsizes.

iteration we have access to a noisy subgradient:

$$\tilde{g}_k = g_k + r_k : g_k \in \partial h(x_k), \|r_k\| \leq R$$

and as before the method iterates for all $k \geq 0$

$$x_{k+1} = P_{\mathcal{C}}(x_k - \alpha_k \tilde{g}_k).$$

One can repeat the analysis of Sec. 3.2 to show

$$d(x_{k+1}, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 \leq d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 - 2\alpha_k d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)(c - R) + 2\alpha_k^2(R^2 + G^2).$$

We see that this is exactly the same recursion as (7) with the error bound constant c replaced by $c - R$, and G^2 replaced by $2(G^2 + R^2)$. Thus, if $R < c$,

all of the results presented throughout for $\theta = 1$ hold with a new error bound constant $\tilde{c} = c - R$, and bound on the subgradients $\tilde{G}^2 = 2(G^2 + R^2)$. In particular this refers to Theorems 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6.

10.7 Incremental Subgradient Methods

Suppose $h(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} h_i(x)$. Such objective functions which are a finite sum of terms often arise in machine learning in the guise of *empirical risk minimization* [28]. For such problems the *incremental* subgradient method can be used [39]. This method proceeds by computing the subgradient with respect to each individual function h_i in a fixed order. More precisely the method proceeds for $k \geq 1$ with $x_1 \in \mathcal{C}$ as

$$x_{k+1} = \psi_{m,k} \tag{63}$$

$$\psi_{i,k} = P_{\mathcal{C}}(\psi_{i-1,k} - \alpha_k g_{i,k}), g_{i,k} \in \partial h_i(\psi_{i-1,k}), \;\; i = 1, \ldots, m \tag{64}$$

$$\psi_{0,k} = x_k. \tag{65}$$

This method has been analyzed extensively in [39].

Proposition 3 ([39]) *Suppose Assumption 3 holds. Then for all $k \geq 1$ the iterates of (63)–(65) satisfy*

$$d(x_{k+1}, \mathcal{X})^2 \leq d(x_k, \mathcal{X})^2 - 2\alpha_k c d(x_k, \mathcal{X})^{\frac{1}{\theta}} + \alpha_k^2 m^2 G^2.$$

This is the same as the main recursion we analyze in (7) with G^2 replaced by $m^2 G^2$. Thus all our results in the following sections apply to the incremental subgradient method (63)–(65) with this change in constants.

10.8 Goffin's Condition Number

Goffin [27] discussed a condition number for quantifying the convergence rate of subgradient methods. The condition number is a generalization of the ordinary notion defined for a smooth strongly convex function as the ratio of the Lipschitz constant of the gradient to the strong convexity parameter. In contrast Goffin's condition number requires neither smoothness or strong convexity. The condition number is also more general than Shor's eccentricity measure [50]. The condition number for a convex function h is defined as

$$\mu_h = \inf \left\{ \frac{\langle u, x - x_p^* \rangle}{\|u\| \|x - x_p^*\|} : x \in \mathcal{C} \backslash \mathcal{X}_h, u \in \partial h(x), x_p^* = \text{proj}_{\mathcal{X}_h}(x) \right\}. \tag{66}$$

By convexity and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality $0 \leq \mu_h \leq 1$. Goffin showed that if h satisfies HEB(c, θ) with $\theta = 1$ and $\|g\| \leq G$ for all $g \in \partial h(x), x \in \mathcal{C}$, then it satisfies (66) with

$$\mu_h \geq \frac{c}{G} = \frac{1}{\kappa}$$

which proves that functions satisfying (66) with $\mu_h > 0$ are more general than weakly sharp functions.

Our results for $\theta = 1$ throughout this manuscript can be extended to functions satisfying (66) with $\mu_h > 0$ if we make a slight modification to the subgradient method.

Lemma 1 ([27]) *Let $\{x_k\}$ be a sequence satisfying*

$$x_{k+1} = P_{\mathcal{C}}\left(x_k - \alpha_k \frac{g_k}{\|g_k\|}\right) : \forall k \geq 1, g_k \in \partial h(x_k), x_1 \in \mathcal{C}. \tag{67}$$

If $\mathcal{X}_h$ is nonempty and h is convex, closed, and proper (CCP) and satisfies (66) with $\mu_h > 0$, then for all $k \geq 1$

$$d(x_{k+1}, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 \leq d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h)^2 - 2\alpha_k \mu_h d(x_k, \mathcal{X}_h) + \alpha_k^2.$$

This is the same recursion as (7) with $G = 1$, $\theta = 1$, and $c = \mu_h$. Thus all the results derived in this manuscript for HEB with $\theta = 1$ can be derived for the scheme (67) applied to functions satisfying (66) so long as c is replaced by μ_h and $G = 1$. Also note that Lemma 1 does not require that the subgradients are uniformly bounded over $\mathcal{C}$.

11 Proof of Theorems 5, 6, and 7

11.1 Preliminaries

In order to determine the convergence rate of the recursion (7) derived in Prop. 1 under nonsummable stepsizes, we need two Lemmas. We start with a result from [46] which considers (7) when $\theta < \frac{1}{2}$ without the nuisance term $\alpha_k^2 G^2$.

Lemma 2 *Suppose*

$$0 \leq u_{k+1} \leq u_k - \gamma_k u_k^{1+q}$$

for $k = 0, 1, \ldots$ where $\gamma_k \geq 0$ and $q > 0$. Then

$$u_k \leq u_0 \left(1 + q u_0^q \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \gamma_i\right)^{-\frac{1}{q}}.$$

Proof [46, Lemma 6 pp. 46].

We will also use the following estimates for the sum of stepsizes $\sum_{i=k_0}^{k} \alpha_i$.

Lemma 3 *Let $k \geq k_0 \geq 1$.*

1. *If* $p \in (0,1)$

$$\sum_{i=k_0}^{k} i^{-p} \geq \frac{(k+1)^{1-p} - k_0^{1-p}}{1-p}.$$

2. *If* $p = 1$

$$\sum_{i=k_0}^{k} i^{-p} \geq \ln \frac{k+1}{k_0}.$$

Proof A straightforward integral test.

11.2 Main Proof for Theorems 5 and 6

Continuing with the main analysis, the goal is to derive convergence rates for a sequence e_k satisfying (7). To this end, let

$$I = \{k : \alpha_k G^2 \geq c e_k^{\gamma}\}. \tag{68}$$

Recall the notation $\gamma = 1/(2\theta)$. We will consider three types of iterates and bound the convergence rate in each case. First, for those iterates $k \in I$ it is easy to derive the convergence rate. Second, we will bound the rate for an iterate in I^c when the previous iterate is in I. Finally we will consider s consecutive iterates in I^c, for which we can use the inequality in (68) to simplify recursion (7). Note that s can be arbitrarily large. In particular when I is finite there are an unbounded number of consecutive iterates in I^c. Together these three cases cover all possible iterates.

First for, $k \in I$ and $\alpha_k > 0$

$$\alpha_k c e_k^{\gamma} \leq \alpha_k^2 G^2 \implies e_k \leq \left(\frac{\alpha_k G^2}{c}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}.$$

Thus the rate of e_k is $O\left(\alpha_k^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}\right)$ for $k \in I$. In particular since $\alpha_k = \alpha_1 k^{-p}$, then for $k \in I$ and $\alpha_1 > 0$

$$e_k \leq \left(\frac{\alpha_1 G^2}{c}\right)^{2\theta} k^{-2p\theta}. \tag{69}$$

Now assume $k \in I$ and $k+1 \in I^c$. Then

$$e_{k+1} \leq e_k + \alpha_k^2 G^2 \leq \left(\frac{\alpha_k G^2}{c}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} + \alpha_k^2 G^2. \tag{70}$$

Now since $\frac{1}{\gamma} = 2\theta \in (0,2)$, for $k \geq 1$

$$k^{-2p\theta} \geq k^{-2p}.$$

Therefore (70) implies that for $k \in I$, $k+1 \in I^c$, and $k \geq 1$,

$$e_{k+1} \leq C_1 (k+1)^{-2p\theta} \tag{71}$$

where

$$C_1 = 2^{2p\theta} \left(\left(\frac{\alpha_1 G^2}{c} \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} + \alpha_1^2 G^2 \right).$$

Next assume $k \in I$, $k+1 \in I^c$, and $k+i \in I^c$ for $i = 2, \dots s$ for some $s \geq 2$. Then for $i = 2, \dots s$

$$e_{k+i} < e_{k+i-1} - \alpha_k c e_{k+i-1}^{\gamma}. \tag{72}$$

To analyze the recursion (72) we consider $\theta < \frac{1}{2}$ and $\theta \geq \frac{1}{2}$ separately.

Case 1: $\boldsymbol{\theta < \frac{1}{2}}$.

Now since $\gamma > 1$ we can apply Lemma 2 along with Lemma 3 to (72) and derive for $i = 2, \dots, s$

$$\begin{aligned} e_{k+i} &\leq e_{k+1} \left[1 + \frac{1-2\theta}{2\theta} e_{k+1}^{\frac{1-2\theta}{2\theta}} \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \alpha_{k+j} \right]^{\frac{2\theta}{2\theta-1}} \\ &\leq e_{k+1} \left[1 + \frac{\alpha_1 (1-2\theta)}{2\theta(1-p)} e_{k+1}^{\frac{1-2\theta}{2\theta}} \left((k+i)^{1-p} - (k+1)^{1-p} \right) \right]^{\frac{2\theta}{2\theta-1}}. \end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

Now consider the condition given in (40). Note that since p satisfies (39), if (40) holds for $k = k_0$, it holds for all $k > k_0$. In particular if it holds for $k = 0$, then it holds for all k. Continuing, if (40) holds then for all $k > k_0$

$$1 - \frac{\alpha_1 (1-2\theta)}{2\theta(1-p)} e_{k+1}^{\frac{1-2\theta}{2\theta}} (k+1)^{1-p} \geq 0 \tag{74}$$

where we have used the fact that $k+1 \in I^c$. Therefore since (74) holds we can simplify (73) to say that for $k \in I$ and $k+i \in I^c$ for $i = 2, 3, \dots, s$, and $k > k_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} e_{k+i} &\leq e_{k+1} \left[\frac{\alpha_1 (1-2\theta)}{2\theta(1-p)} e_{k+1}^{\frac{1-2\theta}{2\theta}} (k+i)^{1-p} \right]^{\frac{2\theta}{2\theta-1}} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{\alpha_1 (1-2\theta)}{2\theta(1-p)} \right)^{\frac{2\theta}{2\theta-1}} (k+i)^{\frac{2\theta(1-p)}{2\theta-1}}. \end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

The final case to consider is when $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ are in I^c. In this case, the same bound (73) can be derived but with e_1 replacing e_{k+1}. Thus for $i = 2, 3, \dots s$ in I

$$e_i \leq e_1 \left[1 + \frac{\alpha_1 (1-2\theta)}{2\theta(1-p)} e_1^{\frac{1-2\theta}{2\theta}} \left(i^{1-p} - 1 \right) \right]^{\frac{2\theta}{2\theta-1}}. \tag{76}$$

Thus if α_1 is chosen to satisfy (41) then

$$e_i \leq \left(\frac{\alpha_1(1-2\theta)}{2\theta(1-p)}\right)^{\frac{2\theta}{2\theta-1}} i^{\frac{2\theta(1-p)}{2\theta-1}}. \tag{77}$$

Combining (69), (71), (75), and (77) establishes (42) and concludes the proof of Theorem 5.

Case 2: $\theta \geq \frac{1}{2}$

Next we consider the case where $\frac{1}{2} \leq \theta \leq 1$ which will finish the proof of Theorem 6. Before commencing we introduce the following Lemma which allows us to bound a decaying exponential by an appropriately scaled decaying polynomial of any degree.

Lemma 4 *Suppose $\delta > 0$, then if $C_\delta \geq e^{-\delta}\delta^\delta$,*

$$\exp(-x) \leq C_\delta x^{-\delta} \quad \forall x > 0. \tag{78}$$

Proof Taking logs of both sides of (78) yields

$$-x \leq -\delta \ln x + \beta_\delta \quad \forall x > 0$$

where $\beta_\delta = \ln C_\delta$. Therefore

$$\beta_\delta \geq \delta \ln x - x \quad \forall x > 0$$

which implies

$$\beta_\delta \geq \max_{x>0}\{\delta \ln x - x\}.$$

The right hand side is a smooth concave coercive maximization problem which therefore has a unique solution given by $x^* = \delta$. Hence

$$\beta_\delta \geq \delta \ln \delta - \delta$$

which implies the Lemma.

Continuing, we consider $k \in I$, $k+1 \in I^c$, and $k+i \in I^c$ for $i = 2 \ldots, s$ in the case where $\theta \geq \frac{1}{2}$, so $\gamma \leq 1$. Then since $k+i \in I^c$ for $i = 2, \ldots s$,

$$0 \leq \frac{e_{k+i-1}}{e_{k+1}} \leq 1 \implies \left(\frac{e_{k+i-1}}{e_{k+1}}\right)^\gamma \geq \frac{e_{k+i-1}}{e_{k+1}} \implies e_{k+i-1}^\gamma \geq e_{k+1}^{\gamma-1} e_{k+i-1}.$$

Thus for $k \in I$, $k+1 \in I^c$, and $k+i \in I^c$ for $i = 2, \ldots, s$ for some $s \geq 2$

$$\begin{aligned} e_{k+i} &\leq e_{k+i-1} - \alpha_{k+i-1} c e_{k+i-1}^\gamma \\ &\leq e_{k+i-1} - \alpha_{k+i-1} e_{k+1}^{\gamma-1} c e_{k+i-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{79}$$

Now taking logs and using $\log(1-x) \leq -x$,

$$\begin{aligned} \ln e_{k+i} &\leq \ln e_{k+i-1} + \ln(1 - e_{k+1}^{\gamma-1} c \alpha_{k+i-1}) \\ &\leq \ln e_{k+i-1} - e_{k+1}^{\gamma-1} c \alpha_{k+i-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Now summing and using Lemma 3

$$\ln e_{k+i} \leq \ln e_{k+1} - \alpha_1 e_{k+1}^{\gamma-1} c \sum_{i=k+1}^{k+i-1} i^{-p}$$
$$\leq \ln e_{k+1} - \frac{\alpha_1 e_{k+1}^{\gamma-1} c}{1-p} \left((k+i)^{1-p} - (k+1)^{1-p} \right).$$

This leads to

$$e_{k+i} \leq e_{k+1} \exp\left\{ -\frac{\alpha_1 e_{k+1}^{\gamma-1} c}{1-p} \left((k+i)^{1-p} - (k+1)^{1-p} \right) \right\} \tag{80}$$
$$= \exp\left\{ -\frac{\alpha_1 e_{k+1}^{\gamma-1} c (k+i)^{1-p}}{1-p} \left(1 - \left(\frac{k+1}{k+i} \right)^{1-p} \right) \right\}.$$

We further consider two possible cases. If $i \geq k$, then

$$\frac{k+1}{k+i} \leq \frac{k+1}{k+k} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2k}$$

therefore by concavity of t^{1-p}

$$\left(\frac{k+1}{k+i} \right)^{1-p} \leq 2^{p-1} \left[1 + \frac{1-p}{k} \right].$$

Take $k > 3$ so that

$$\frac{2^{p-1}(1-p)}{k} \leq \frac{1-2^{p-1}}{2}.$$

Hence

$$1 - \left(\frac{k+1}{k+i} \right)^{1-p} \geq 1 - 2^{p-1} \left[1 + \frac{1-p}{k} \right] \geq 1 - 2^{p-1} - \frac{2^{p-1}(1-p)}{k} \geq \frac{1-2^{p-1}}{2}.$$

Hence if $3 < k \leq i$ then

$$e_{k+i} \leq e_{k+1} \exp\left(-\frac{(1-2^{p-1}) \alpha_1 e_{k+1}^{\gamma-1} c}{2(1-p)} (k+i)^{1-p} \right). \tag{81}$$

Now by Lemma 4 for any $\delta_1 > 0$,

$$\exp\left\{ -\frac{\alpha_1 (1-2^{p-1}) c e_{k+1}^{\gamma-1}}{2(1-p)} (k+i)^{1-p} \right\}$$
$$\leq \delta_1^{\delta_1} e^{-\delta_1} e_{k+1}^{1+\delta_1(1-\gamma)} \left(\frac{\alpha_1 (1-2^{p-1}) c}{2(1-p)} (k+i)^{1-p} \right)^{-\delta_1}.$$

Therefore using (71) for any $k \leq i$ and $k > 3$

$$e_{k+i} \leq \delta_1^{\delta_1} C_1^{1+\delta_1(1-\gamma)} \left(\frac{\alpha_1 (1-2^{p-1}) c e}{2(1-p)} \right)^{-\delta_1} (k+i)^{-\delta_1(1-p)}. \tag{82}$$

Taking $\delta_1 = \frac{2p\theta}{1-p}$ and simplifying (82) yields

$$e_{k+i} \leq C_1^{\frac{1+2p(\theta-1)}{1-p}} \left(\frac{\alpha_1(1-2^{p-1})ce}{4p\theta}\right)^{-\frac{2p\theta}{1-p}} (k+i)^{-2p\theta}. \tag{83}$$

Next consider $k \geq i > 1$. Now

$$\begin{aligned}
(k+i)^{1-p} - (k+1)^{1-p} &= (k+i)^{1-p}\left(1 - \left(\frac{k+1}{k+i}\right)^{1-p}\right) \\
&= (k+i)^{1-p}\left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{i-1}{k+i}\right)^{1-p}\right) \\
&\geq (k+i)^{1-p}\left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{i-1}{2k}\right)^{1-p}\right) \\
&\geq \frac{(1-p)(k+i)^{1-p}(i-1)}{2k} \qquad (84) \\
&\geq \frac{1-p}{2}k^{-p}(i-1)
\end{aligned}$$

where in (84) we used the concavity of t^{1-p}. Thus substituting this into (80) implies for $k \geq i$

$$e_{k+i} \leq e_{k+1} \exp\left(\frac{-\alpha_1 e_{k+1}^{\gamma-1} c(i-1)}{2k^p}\right).$$

Therefore for all $\delta_2 \geq 0$ it follows Lemma 4 that

$$\begin{aligned}
e_{k+i} &\leq e_{k+1} \exp\left(\frac{-\alpha_1 e_{k+1}^{\gamma-1} c(i-1)}{2k^p}\right) \\
&\leq \delta_2^{\delta_2} e_{k+1} \left(\frac{\alpha_1 e_{k+1}^{\gamma-1} c(i-1)e}{2k^p}\right)^{-\delta_2} \\
&\leq C_1^{1+\delta_2(1-\gamma)} \left(\frac{4\delta_2}{c\alpha_1 e}\right)^{\delta_2} k^{-2p\theta(1+\delta_2(1-\gamma))} k^{p\delta_2} i^{-\delta_2} \qquad (85)
\end{aligned}$$

where we used $e_{k+1} \leq C_1 k^{-2p\theta}$ and $(i-1)^{-\delta_2} \leq 2^{\delta_2} i^{-\delta_2}$. Now if we choose

$$\delta_2 = 2\theta \tag{86}$$

then (85) implies

$$e_{k+i} \leq C_4 i^{-2\theta} \tag{87}$$

where

$$C_4 = \left(\frac{8\theta C_1}{c\alpha_1 e}\right)^{2\theta}. \tag{88}$$

Thus combining $e_{k+i} \leq e_{k+1} \leq C_1 k^{-2p\theta}$ and (87) implies that for $i \leq k$

$$e_{k+i} \leq \max\{C_1, C_4\} \min\{k^{-2p\theta}, i^{-2\theta}\}.$$

Now since $-2\theta < -2p\theta$,

$$e_{k+i} \leq \max\{C_1, C_4\} \min\{k^{-2p\theta}, i^{-2p\theta}\} \leq \frac{\max\{C_1, C_4\}}{\max\{k^{2p\theta}, i^{2p\theta}\}}.$$

If $2p\theta \geq 1$ then by convexity of $t^{2p\theta}$

$$\max\{k^{2p\theta}, i^{2p\theta}\} \geq \frac{1}{2}\left(k^{2p\theta} + i^{2p\theta}\right) \geq 2^{-2p\theta}\left(k+i\right)^{2p\theta}. \tag{89}$$

On the other hand if $2p\theta < 1$ then because $t^{2p\theta}$ is subadditive

$$\max\{k^{2p\theta}, i^{2p\theta}\} \geq \frac{1}{2}\left(k^{2p\theta} + i^{2p\theta}\right) \geq \frac{1}{2}\left(k+i\right)^{2p\theta}. \tag{90}$$

Combining (89) and (90) gives

$$e_{k+i} \leq 4\max\{C_1, C_4\}(k+i)^{-2p\theta}. \tag{91}$$

Finally we consider the case where the first s iterates belong to I^c. Therefore, using (80), for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, s$

$$e_i \leq e_1 \exp\left\{-\frac{\alpha_1 e_1^{\gamma-1} c}{1-p}\left(i^{1-p} - 1\right)\right\}. \tag{92}$$

Now since for $x \geq 1$, $x - 1 \geq \frac{x}{2}$, this implies that

$$e_i \leq e_1 \exp\left\{-\frac{\alpha_1 e_1^{\gamma-1} c}{2(1-p)} i^{1-p}\right\}.$$

Using Lemma 4 this implies that for any $\delta_3 > 0$

$$e_i \leq e^{-\delta_3}\delta_3^{\delta_3} e_1 \left(\frac{\alpha_1 e_1^{\gamma-1} c}{2(1-p)} i^{1-p}\right)^{-\delta_3}. \tag{93}$$

and we will use $\delta_3 = \frac{2p\theta}{1-p}$.

Combining (69), (71), (83), (91), and (93) yields the desired result (44) and concludes the proof of Theorem 6.

11.3 Proof of Theorem 7

The format of the proof is identical to Theorems 5 and 6. As before it is based on the set I defined in (68) and we consider three types of iterates. First we bound the convergence rate for iterates in I, second for iterates in I^c when the previous iterate is in I. And finally for s consecutive iterates in I^c where s may be unbounded.

If $k \in I$ then repeating (71) yields

$$e_k \leq \frac{\alpha_1 G^2}{c} k^{-1}. \tag{94}$$

Similarly for $k \in I$ and $k+1 \in I^c$,

$$e_{k+1} \leq \frac{2\alpha_1 G^2}{c} (k+1)^{-1}. \tag{95}$$

Finally for $k \in I$, $k+1 \in I^c$, and $k+i \in I^c$, for $i = 2, \ldots, s$, then repeating (79) but with $\gamma = 1$ this time,

$$e_{k+i} \leq e_{k+i-1}(1 - c\alpha_{k+i-1}).$$

Taking logs, using $\log(1-x) \leq -x$ and summing yields

$$\begin{aligned} \log e_{k+i} &\leq \log e_{k+1} - c\alpha_1 \sum_{j=k+1}^{k+i-1} j^{-1} \\ &\leq \log e_{k+1} - c\alpha_1 \left(\log(k+i) - \log(k+1)\right) \end{aligned}$$

where we applied Lemma 3 in the second inequality. This yields for all $k \in I$ and $k+i \in I^c$ for $i = 2, 3, \ldots, s$ for some $s \in \mathbb{N}$

$$e_{k+i} \leq e_{k+1} \left(\frac{k+i}{k+1}\right)^{-c\alpha_1}. \tag{96}$$

Using (95) yields

$$\begin{aligned} e_{k+i} &\leq \frac{2\alpha_1 G^2}{c} (k+1)^{-1} (k+1)^{c\alpha_1} (k+i)^{-c\alpha_1} \\ &\leq \frac{2\alpha_1 G^2}{c} (k+i)^{-c\alpha_1} \end{aligned} \tag{97}$$

Finally we consider the case where the initial iterates $i = 1, 2, \ldots, s$ are in I^c. Therefore repeating (96) with $k = 0$ gives

$$e_i \leq e_1 i^{-c\alpha_1} \tag{98}$$

Combining (94), (95), (97), and (98) yields (45) and concludes the proof of Theorem 7.

11.4 Proof of Proposition 2

As previously mentioned, this argument is a direct extension of [31, Thm. 4]. For $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$, (7) reads as

$$e_{k+1} \leq (1 - 2\alpha_k c)e_k + \alpha_k^2 G^2.$$

We consider the choice $\alpha_k = \frac{2k+1}{2c(k+1)^2}$. Then

$$e_{k+1} \leq \left(1 - \frac{2k+1}{(k+1)^2}\right) e_k + \frac{G^2(2k+1)^2}{4c^2(k+1)^4}.$$

Multiplying both sides by $(k+1)^2$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}(k+1)^2 e_{k+1} &\leq k^2 e_k + \frac{G^2(2k+1)^2}{4c^2(k+1)^2} \\ &\leq k^2 e_k + \frac{G^2}{c^2} \\ &\leq e_1 + \frac{G^2}{c^2} k.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$e_{k+1} \leq \frac{e_1}{(k+1)^2} + \frac{G^2}{c^2(k+1)}.$$

Acknowledgments. We thank Prof. Niao He for many illuminating and important discussions.

References

1. Agrb, G.: Maximum likelihood and ℓ_p-norm estimators. Statistics Applicata **4**(1), 7 (1992)
2. Attouch, H., Bolte, J., Svaiter, B.F.: Convergence of descent methods for semi-algebraic and tame problems: proximal algorithms, forward–backward splitting, and regularized Gauss–Seidel methods. Mathematical Programming **137**(1-2), 91–129 (2013)
3. Bach, F., et al.: Learning with submodular functions: A convex optimization perspective. Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning **6**(2-3), 145–373 (2013)
4. Barrodale, I., Roberts, F.D.: An improved algorithm for discrete l_1 linear approximation. SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis **10**(5), 839–848 (1973)
5. Bauschke, H.H., Combettes, P.L.: Convex Analysis and Monotone Operator Theory in Hilbert Spaces. Springer Science & Business Media (2011)
6. Beck, A., Shtern, S.: Linearly convergent away-step conditional gradient for non-strongly convex functions. Mathematical Programming pp. 1–27 (2015)
7. Bertsekas, D.P.: Nonlinear Programming, 2nd edn. Athena Scientific (1999)
8. Bolte, J., Daniilidis, A., Lewis, A.: The Łojasiewicz inequality for nonsmooth subanalytic functions with applications to subgradient dynamical systems. SIAM Journal on Optimization **17**(4), 1205–1223 (2007)
9. Bolte, J., Nguyen, T.P., Peypouquet, J., Suter, B.W.: From error bounds to the complexity of first-order descent methods for convex functions. Mathematical Programming pp. 1–37 (2015)

10. Borwein, J.M., Li, G., Yao, L.: Analysis of the convergence rate for the cyclic projection algorithm applied to basic semialgebraic convex sets. SIAM Journal on Optimization **24**(1), 498–527 (2014)
11. Bubeck, S., et al.: Convex optimization: Algorithms and complexity. Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning **8**(3-4), 231–357 (2015)
12. Burke, J., Deng, S.: Weak sharp minima revisited part i: basic theory. Control and Cybernetics **31**, 439–469 (2002)
13. Burke, J., Ferris, M.C.: Weak sharp minima in mathematical programming. SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization **31**(5), 1340–1359 (1993)
14. Chambolle, A.: An algorithm for total variation minimization and applications. Journal of Mathematical Imaging and Vision **20**(1-2), 89–97 (2004)
15. Chambolle, A., Pock, T.: A first-order primal-dual algorithm for convex problems with applications to imaging. Journal of Mathematical Imaging and Vision **40**(1), 120–145 (2011)
16. Combettes, P.L., Pesquet, J.C.: Proximal splitting methods in signal processing. In: Fixed-Point Algorithms for Inverse Problems in Science and Engineering, pp. 185–212. Springer (2011)
17. Davis, D., Yin, W.: A three-operator splitting scheme and its optimization applications. arXiv preprint arXiv:1504.01032 (2015)
18. Donoho, D.L.: Compressed sensing. Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on **52**(4), 1289–1306 (2006)
19. Drusvyatskiy, D., Lewis, A.S.: Error bounds, quadratic growth, and linear convergence of proximal methods. arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.06661 (2016)
20. Duchi, J., Shalev-Shwartz, S., Singer, Y., Chandra, T.: Efficient projections onto the ℓ_1-ball for learning in high dimensions. In: Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Machine Learning, pp. 272–279. ACM (2008)
21. Eckstein, J., Yao, W.: Augmented Lagrangian and alternating direction methods for convex optimization: A tutorial and some illustrative computational results. RUTCOR Research Reports **32** (2012)
22. Efron, B., Hastie, T., Johnstone, I., Tibshirani, R., et al.: Least angle regression. The Annals of Statistics **32**(2), 407–499 (2004)
23. Ferris, M.C.: Finite termination of the proximal point algorithm. Mathematical Programming **50**(1), 359–366 (1991)
24. Freund, R.M., Lu, H.: New computational guarantees for solving convex optimization problems with first order methods, via a function growth condition measure. arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.02974 (2015)
25. Gao, X., Huang, J.: Asymptotic analysis of high-dimensional lad regression with lasso. Statistica Sinica pp. 1485–1506 (2010)
26. Gilpin, A., Pena, J., Sandholm, T.: First-order algorithm with $O(\ln(1/\epsilon))$ convergence for ϵ-equilibrium in two-person zero-sum games. Mathematical Programming **133**(1-2), 279–298 (2012)
27. Goffin, J.L.: On convergence rates of subgradient optimization methods. Mathematical Programming **13**(1), 329–347 (1977)
28. Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., Friedman, J., Hastie, T., Friedman, J., Tibshirani, R.: The Elements of Statistical Learning. Springer (2009)
29. Hou, K., Zhou, Z., So, A.M.C., Luo, Z.Q.: On the linear convergence of the proximal gradient method for trace norm regularization. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, pp. 710–718 (2013)
30. Iouditski, A., Nesterov, Y.: Primal-dual subgradient methods for minimizing uniformly convex functions. arXiv preprint arXiv:1401.1792 (2014)
31. Karimi, H., Nutini, J., Schmidt, M.: Linear Convergence of Gradient and Proximal-Gradient Methods Under the Polyak-Łojasiewicz Condition. In: Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases, pp. 795–811. Springer (2016)
32. Kivinen, J., Smola, A.J., Williamson, R.C.: Online learning with kernels. IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing **52**(8), 2165–2176 (2004)
33. Li, G.: Global error bounds for piecewise convex polynomials. Mathematical Programming **137**(1-2), 37–64 (2013)

34. Li, Y., Arce, G.R.: A maximum likelihood approach to least absolute deviation regression. EURASIP Journal on Advances in Signal Processing **2004**(12), 948,982 (2004)
35. Lim, E.: On the convergence rate for stochastic approximation in the nonsmooth setting. Mathematics of Operations Research **36**(3), 527–537 (2011)
36. Luo, Z.Q., Tseng, P.: Error bounds and convergence analysis of feasible descent methods: a general approach. Annals of Operations Research **46**(1), 157–178 (1993)
37. Money, A., Affleck-Graves, J., Hart, M., Barr, G.: The linear regression model: Lp norm estimation and the choice of p. Communications in Statistics-Simulation and Computation **11**(1), 89–109 (1982)
38. Necoara, I., Nesterov, Y., Glineur, F.: Linear convergence of first order methods for non-strongly convex optimization. arXiv preprint arXiv:1504.06298 (2015)
39. Nedić, A., Bertsekas, D.: Convergence rate of incremental subgradient algorithms. In: Stochastic Optimization: Algorithms and Applications, pp. 223–264. Springer (2001)
40. Nedić, A., Bertsekas, D.P.: The effect of deterministic noise in subgradient methods. Mathematical Programming **125**(1), 75–99 (2010)
41. Nedic, A., Lee, S.: On stochastic subgradient mirror-descent algorithm with weighted averaging. SIAM Journal on Optimization **24**(1), 84–107 (2014)
42. Nemirovski, A., Juditsky, A., Lan, G., Shapiro, A.: Robust stochastic approximation approach to stochastic programming. SIAM Journal on Optimization **19**(4), 1574–1609 (2009)
43. Nyquist, H.: The optimal L_p norm estimator in linear regression models. Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods **12**(21), 2511–2524 (1983)
44. Pang, J.S.: Error bounds in mathematical programming. Mathematical Programming **79**(1-3), 299–332 (1997)
45. Poljak, B.: Nonlinear programming methods in the presence of noise. Mathematical Programming **14**(1), 87–97 (1978)
46. Polyak, B.T.: Introduction to Optimization. Optimization Software Inc. (1987)
47. Renegar, J.: A framework for applying subgradient methods to conic optimization problems. arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02611 (2015)
48. Renegar, J.: "efficient" subgradient methods for general convex optimization. SIAM Journal on Optimization **26**(4), 2649–2676 (2016)
49. Rosenberg, E.: A geometrically convergent subgradient optimization method for nonlinearly constrained convex programs. Mathematics of Operations Research **13**(3), 512–523 (1988)
50. Shor, N.Z.: Minimization Methods for Non-Differentiable Functions, vol. 3. Springer Science & Business Media (2012)
51. Supittayapornpong, S., Neely, M.J.: Staggered time average algorithm for stochastic non-smooth optimization with $O(1/T)$ convergence. arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.02842 (2016)
52. Tibshirani, R.: Regression shrinkage and selection via the LASSO. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological) pp. 267–288 (1996)
53. Tseng, P.: Approximation accuracy, gradient methods, and error bound for structured convex optimization. Mathematical Programming **125**(2), 263–295 (2010)
54. Wang, L.: The ℓ_1 penalized LAD estimator for high dimensional linear regression. Journal of Multivariate Analysis **120**, 135–151 (2013)
55. Wang, L., Gordon, M.D., Zhu, J.: Regularized least absolute deviations regression and an efficient algorithm for parameter tuning. In: Data Mining, 2006. ICDM'06. Sixth International Conference on, pp. 690–700. IEEE (2006)
56. Wu, T.T., Lange, K.: Coordinate descent algorithms for lasso penalized regression. The Annals of Applied Statistics pp. 224–244 (2008)
57. Xu, Y., Lin, Q., Yang, T.: Accelerate stochastic subgradient method by leveraging local error bound. arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.01027 (2016)
58. Yang, T., Lin, Q.: RSG: beating subgradient method without smoothness and strong convexity. arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.03107 (2015)
59. Zhang, H.: New analysis of linear convergence of gradient-type methods via unifying error bound conditions. arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.00269 (2016)
60. Zhang, H., Yin, W.: Gradient methods for convex minimization: better rates under weaker conditions. arXiv preprint arXiv:1303.4645 (2013)

61. Zhou, Z., So, A.M.C.: A unified approach to error bounds for structured convex optimization problems. Mathematical Programming pp. 1–40 (2017). DOI 10.1007/s10107-016-1100-9. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10107-016-1100-9
62. Zhu, J., Rosset, S., Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R.: 1-norm support vector machines. In: NIPS, vol. 15, pp. 49–56 (2003)